THEOLOGY

VOL. LXII MAY, 1959 No. 467

Editorial

IF any of our readers, who have not had the pleasure of meeting the new Bishop of Southwark, want to know what sort of a man he is, they will get a very fair impression from his new book, *The Faith To-day* (S.P.C.K., 5s.). Some authors are—fortunately or unfortunately, as the case may be—quite unlike what their books lead you to expect. But there is no such dichotomy in Mervyn Stockwood. He is all of a piece. *The Faith To-day* is a course of sermons which he preached to undergraduates from the pulpit of Great St Mary's Church, Cambridge. They constitute a clear and down-to-earth exposition of the Christian faith and its practical implications. It is definite without being cocksure and challenging without being strident. There are no flowers of rhetoric but there is plenty of wit. This preacher is shrewd, but not subtle. He may not be an intellectual, but he has a great respect for intelligence (which, alas! cannot be said of all preachers), and he addresses himself to the intelligence of his hearers and readers. At the same time, he never tires of driving home the truth that a faith which does not issue in action, including political action, is vain. The printed word should appeal to students and others almost as much as the word that was spoken in Cambridge—and that will now be spoken in Southwark though no doubt on a different wave-length.

When it is said that there is a notable revival of religion in universities, it should not be inferred that a large majority of undergraduates are convinced or converted Christians. This is not so, but it is evident that the Christian faith can be so presented as to engage and hold the interest of a substantial section of the student world. The Bishop of Southwark's ministry at Cambridge demonstrated this possibility, just as the present Bishop of Southwell's did at Oxford thirty years ago.

Preachers and teachers in other environments may with advantage study the spirit and style of *The Faith To-day*. Nevertheless, if, as we suppose, it is easier to be a Christian nowadays with one's intellect than with one's imagination, then the ministry of poets and artists may be of even more consequence than that of preachers and prophets, unless of course there can be a happy confluence of them both.

* * * * *

There is a steady and welcome output of biographical studies of Anglican prelates and divines, especially of those who flourished in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. They afford an acceptable opportunity of becoming better acquainted with the past history of *Ecclesia Anglicana*. The most recent to appear is a study of Richard Chenevix Trench—*The Man of Ten Talents* by J. Bromley

(S.P.C.K., 25s.). Trench was one of the Cambridge "Apostles". He was H. J. Rose's curate at the time of the meeting at Hadleigh which played a part in the initiation of the Oxford Movement. He was subsequently a parochial incumbent, a professor at King's College, London, Dean of Westminster, and Archbishop of Dublin. He was an influential theologian in his time and an enthusiastic philologist. He was also a profuse poet, though we cannot say that his poetry is as memorable as it was felt to be by his contemporaries. Mr Bromley rates it more highly, and quotes it more freely, than we should have expected. It was during Trench's occupancy of the see of Dublin that the Church of Ireland was disestablished, and he was prominent both in opposing the measure and in handling the difficult situation that arose when it had been passed. Mr Bromley unfolds the story with much skill. The sources available for Trench's life are, however, in some respects disappointing. Little information seems to be recoverable about his methods as a parish priest or as a diocesan bishop. He was a man of somewhat sombre temperament. He had many and varied friends, of whom the closest was Samuel Wilberforce, but Lavington is in Sussex, not Surrey (p. 206).

* * * * *

Autres temps autres mœurs. "It is sad to see that the vast Diocese of Chester, (as it was before the erection of the See of Manchester,) has only two daily services, besides its two cathedrals; that the Diocese of Norwich, with the church-teeming counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, has in the former only two daily services except the cathedral; in the latter the same number, one of which has existed from time immemorial; while the Diocese of Durham has but one except the cathedral. The Bishop of Worcester, the only prelate, probably, since the days of the Apostles, that has had the boldness, *ex cathedra,* to speak against the daily prayers of the Church, has not been able to persuade his Clergy that they are useless; six, at least, offer them. Next come Gloucestershire and Yorkshire, with twenty-four; Essex and Wilts, with seventeen; Oxfordshire, with sixteen; Huntingdonshire, Cheshire, and Durham, without a single parochial daily service (while even Rutland has *one*); Cumberland, with one; Bucks, Derby, Herts, Lancashire, Norfolk, Northumberland, Salop, and Suffolk, with two, are the worst. In proportion to its size, Lincolnshire, with five, has cause for shame.

"We cannot but notice, as specimens of what things ought to be, the instances of Harlow, with its three, and Hawarden, with its two churches, each celebrating daily prayers twice."—*The Christian Remembrancer,* April 1849, p. 343.

Ad Episcopum[1]

It was heavy tidings, my fathers and my brethren, that they brought to us in Cambridge last November. We had seen, in a little more than three years, our University Church of Great St Mary's raised up from the very earth to be all, or almost all, that such a church could be. And when, with that work so recent, so manifestly important, so still precariously poised, they came to us saying, "Knowest thou the Lord will take away thy prophet from thy head to-day?" it was as much as some of us could do at first to answer, "Yea, I know it, hold ye your peace". Later thought, greater thought, led us to accept, and even to approve, the choice, for indeed our first instinctive response was in more ways than one misplaced. Misplaced because, unhappily, we could not then be certain that the succession would be maintained, tragic though it would be if it were not; misplaced also because chariots of fire are not even metaphorically appropriate vehicles for elevation to the modern episcopate. For the office of bishop has become to-day in many respects a thankless one. It entails much unseen pedestrian labour: it presents a broad target to the shafts of criticism; as who, my dear Mervyn, knows better than you, who have launched so many of them yourself? And since I have stumbled on this direct form of address, I will take leave for a few minutes to adhere to it.

I will begin by venturing a few words on the most important part of all your work, your dealings with your clergy. First then, I hope that you will sedulously maintain for them such little as is left of the parson's freehold; and more generally that you will endeavour to preserve the Church of England as the least dragooned and regimented body in our over-regimented land. It is of great importance that in matters of small importance your clergy should feel free to differ from you; knowing that neither their pittances nor their promotion will be endangered if they do. And about those pittances. Remember that a man is almost forced to think too much about money if he has really too little of it. And since it is not a good thing that our clergy should think too much about money, therefore it would be a good thing if they could have a little more of it. In this respect they perhaps owe more to our present Primate than they always realize; for certainly, during his reign, the Church Commissioners have shown a financial acumen which many colleges at either University might envy. But in these inflationary times, you have, like the Red Queen in Alice, to run very fast even to remain in the same place; and in spite of their greater number of paper pounds our clergy, as a whole, are worse off now than they were a generation ago. And in some cases this means hidden, but really harassing, poverty.

Next, almost anyone else in your place I would urge to make some opportunity of hearing your clergy preach, even if it meant giving them less opportunity of hearing *you* preach. It is, I am sure, a real

[1] Sermon preached in Southwark Cathedral at the consecration of the Bishop of Southwark on 1 May 1959.

loss that so very many of our bishops have heard so very few of their own clergy preach. But to you, my brother, I hesitate to say this. For to you has been given a measure of eloquence; a rare gift, a noble gift, although unharnessed it can be a dangerous gift. But harnessed, not shackled, it will be all the more valuable in your new office, since not many holders of that office possess it.

Of your administrative work I lack the knowledge to speak. Still, one thing even about this I will say. Academically, I have known men who became so engrossed by administration as to let their intellectual life be choked by it. I can conceive the possibility of the same thing happening to the spiritual life. You will, quite rightly, be busied about many things, and cumbered with much service. All the more, therefore, must you hold fast to the *unum necessarium*, and to your proper business of prayer. I am completely certain that no combination of episcopal activities can quite take the place of the instinctive recognition which the clergy should have in facing their bishop that they are coming into the presence of a man of prayer. It is in no sense a mere moral *élite*, this comradeship, so we have no need to feel shy in speaking of it. Indeed, for myself, I could never feel certain that the gospels do depict a quite flawless or perfect character. I accept the sinlessness of the figure there portrayed solely, but wholly, because the Church so teaches. But the presence and power of Christ; but his aid and advocacy; but the actuality of access to him in prayer; these things I accept, not because the Bible so teaches, or the Church so teaches—glad though I am that they *do* so teach—but because, like uncounted thousands before me and around me, I have known them for almost physical facts. And, Mervyn, the very first time we met, I knew that you knew that too.

A word now about the ordinands whom you will draw to your half-dechristianized diocese, many of them I hope from Cambridge; where at this moment there are potential ordinands as good as any I have known during my five years at one University and nearly fifty at the other. I hope that you will occasionally exercise your dispensing power to excuse such men at any rate a second year at a theological college. The latest ideas of the day before yesterday are not necessarily the best ideas for to-day; and men with a University honours degree, who see their contemporaries already starting on *their* life's work, do not always appreciate a two-year prolongation of a sort of undergraduate existence, with teaching distracted, and sometimes dominated, by the requirements of a pass examination, in subjects some of which seem almost shockingly remote from the actual needs of pastoral and parochial life to-day. And if even exceptionally this experience engenders a sense of frustration, then you have waste of time, waste of money, waste of man-power and waste of youth. Now we are for ever lamenting the high average age of our clergy, and who am I, myself nearer eighty than seventy, to rebut that charge? But I would remind you, my brother—and you also, my right reverend fathers—that though our rubrics rightly and rigorously refuse the priesthood to any man not fully twenty-four, they no less clearly contemplate the possibility of extending the

diaconate to men of under twenty-three. I believe the time has come when we might widely and wisely avail ourselves of the permission thus envisaged. A two-year diaconate, from twenty-two to twenty-four, would add a whole year of youth to the ministry of the Church. It would increase the number of men available as curates, while decreasing the sums, the vast sums, spent on giving an abstract and theoretical training to men not all of whom appear to profit by it. And were they but half as fortunate in their vicars as I was in mine, they could, under wise and fatherly direction, learn their job in the best of all possible ways, by *doing* it; the way in which at the time of my own ordination the great majority of our clergy *had* learnt it; the only way, I still believe, in which much of it ever *can* be learnt.

In this connexion I am glad to think that this will in future be one of the, I hope, increasing number of dioceses in which the question to deacons, "Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament?" will be put in the mitigated form of 1928. It is not right that in the act of entering the ministry, and as a condition of entering it, a man should be forced to make a statement which is, in the plain sense of words, untrue. The continued use of that question, in its original form, invalidates the whole claim of the Church of England to *care* about truth.

This brings me, Mervyn, to the last and most important thing I have to say to you. One quality you have which you must at all costs keep: courage. You have shown it in the past: you will need it in the future. Need it, because "Ye fearful saints, fresh courage take" must be your constant missive to your clergy, many of them working under desperately discouraging conditions; and what you would evoke you must have. No man can evoke what he hasn't got. But you will need it also for another reason. There are some evils both in Church and State which can only be ended by courage in high places. Therefore they last long; as the State has lately shown us by giving a fresh lease of life to a bad law, through timidity in *its* high places; a law in which stupidity and barbarity are so equally compounded that no man has yet determined which ingredient in it is the greater. Such ills will last till God sends us braver men. But they will not last for ever, and the day will come when men will look back in wonder at the arguments with which they were defended; always supposing, that is, that in this island or on this earth anyone is left alive to look back with any emotion on anything.

So much the rather must you cling to courage. On that virtue, and its source for you, I will end by quoting a greater preacher than myself. "You who day by day offer up the Immaculate Lamb of God: you who hold in your hands the Incarnate Word, under the visible tokens he himself ordained, you who time and again drain the chalice of the Great Victim, what can stop you or startle you? Who is to make you afraid?" The University Churches of Oxford and Cambridge have each known one vicar whom undergraduates went out for to hear: *mutatis mutandis*, one of them may still receive that message from the other. *Mutatis mutandis*, for I hope that after all

you will feel at least equally at home with the words used by another Oxford poet—another Fellow of Oriel—to describe his chance encounter with a slum parson, in the hot and squalid streets of Bethnal Green.

> " 'Ill and o'erwork'd, how fare you in this scene?'
> 'Bravely!' said he, 'for I of late have been
> Much cheer'd by thoughts of Christ, *the living bread.*' "

The language—and perhaps more than the language—differs; but the virtue, courage, is the same, and the source of it the same; and from that fount of all goodness you yourself may draw on it continually.

And so, my brother, whom in age I might call my son; whom, this service ended, I shall salute as father, as I kneel to kiss your ring and ask your blessing; I doubt not I shall receive it from a prophet new inspired. And were I to give utterance to words rising unbidden to my lips, they would carry me back in conclusion to the Scripture with which I began: "My father, my father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof."

May God grant it. Amen.

F. A. Simpson.

Worship as the Centre of Parish Life[1]

I am sorry to begin with the dull business of defining terms. "Worship" we may define, without great difficulty, as the response of the soul to the prevenient God of which liturgy, in the widest sense of the term, is the outward corporate manifestation. The word "parish" is becoming increasingly difficult to define. The original meaning (from the Greek παροικία, meaning originally the diocese, and later the divisions of the diocese geographically defined), is too restrictive since, on the one hand, the geographical parish system is largely breaking down in urban areas, while, on the other, for many of us the word parish does not represent a strictly defined and delimited geographical area at all. Our Anglican churches on the Continent of Europe are one example of this. In this other sense the parish consists of all those who point to a particular church building and say "that is my church" and who are accepted by that part of the Body of Christ which worships therein.

This means that the problem must present itself in two ways. In England, and in certain other parts of the Anglican Communion, the old conception of the parish is still strong. Legally, in England, the parish priest is charged with the spiritual care of all who live within the boundaries of his parish. It thus includes the faithful and the faithless; the regular communicant, those who firmly claim to be

[1] A paper read at the conversations between a delegation from the Anglican Church and a delegation from the French Reformed Church at Bièvres in September 1958.

"church people" but never come to church, and the minority who deliberately repudiate the name of Christian. For such a parish priest the problem of making worship the centre of the life of the parish is infinitely more complex than it is for the clergyman whose "parish" consists of those who say "that is my church", since in the latter case some sort of act of commitment has been made.

It is not our purpose here to speak of those who deliberately repudiate the name of Christ. But even with those who remain, nominal members, and too often committed members, of the Body of Christ, worship in the sense we are speaking of it here as the corporate act of the worshipping Body, is not the centre of parish life.

I have defined worship as "the response of the soul to the prevenient God". That response is normally initially personal and individual, and much of it rightly remains so. There is nothing wrong in worshipping God under the "blue dome of heaven", or when contemplating a sunset; indeed, it is wholly right to do so. But it is incomplete. The soul which seeks truly to respond to God is led to supplement and to fulfil the personal response by an identification with the worshipping Body of Christ. That identification is ideally made with the whole worshipping Body—with the Church triumphant in heaven as with the Church militant here in earth—but the identification can only be initially made, and continually expressed and renewed, by an identification with the worshipping Body of Christ as locally represented in the individual church or parish.

It is not, I am grateful to say, my duty to enlarge upon the different interpretations we give to our Lord's command to "Do this in remembrance of me". Mine the happier task of emphasizing that we are one, and in general all Christendom is one, in asserting that when we do fulfil that command we are taking part in the highest act of worship of which the Church on earth is capable. We may interpret the command as Catholic tradition does, that it should be a daily activity, or as the Protestant tradition has generally tended to do, that it is so sacred an act that due time must elapse between its each performance for the faithful to be prepared truly to participate in it. But we are united on its centrality in the life of Christian devotion.

When we speak, then, of worship as the centre of parish life we are speaking primarily of the Eucharist and of that which surrounds it. In our Anglican tradition it is surrounded by the offices of Morning and Evening Prayer, wherein the Scripture is read and the Psalter recited. But when we speak of this as the centre of parish life we know well that we are looking towards an ideal, and not describing a present reality. The weakness is apparent when we try to make the personal response part of a corporate act of the whole people of God. This weakness means, I suggest, that the failure is not really devotional or even liturgical, but ecclesiological. The Roman Catholic Church very wisely preceded her liturgical revival by a revival of the doctrine of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ, and Dom Olivier Rousseau, in his *Histoire du Mouvement liturgique*, shows the influence of such men as Möhler in its preparation. I re-

joiced, therefore, to read in a book of Prof. J.-D. Benoit, recently published in England, the following words:

"Now the Protestant, despite his deep-rooted individualism, is in process of rediscovering the meaning of the Church. This is the whole trend of the theology of recent decades. Increasing numbers of books have been published, studying and defining the doctrine of the Body of Christ. . . . This new sense of the Church shows itself in a revival of participation in the Eucharist. . . . More and more are coming to it, and the proportion of young people is a joy to see."[1]

A revival of true corporate worship in our parishes, a revival of the sense of that worship as the hub around which the parish revolves, must be preceded by a revival of the sense of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ, whose members have one with another a solidarity which transcends all earthly relationships. Wherever there has been such an ecclesiological revival, there has been a revival or corporate worship. But such a revival seems to me to carry with it certain corollaries: the necessary involvement of the whole of human life both ecclesiologically and liturgically; and, secondly, the fact that liturgical worship must be that of the whole worshipping Body, and not merely of its chosen representatives.

"The Church service is the Assembly of the People of God", says Father Gabriel Hebert, "a Body met together in union with its Head, like a regiment of soldiers on parade; an assembly conscious of the basis upon which it is constituted. Its existence depends upon divine will and purpose. Therefore Christian worship is in the first place a confession of faith in God, and a commemoration of God's work of salvation; and then an expression of the application of that salvation to the whole of human life."[2]

Let me repeat those last words: "An expression of the application of that salvation to the whole of human life." The Lord Jesus Christ through whom, in the power of the Spirit, we worship the Father, is the Lord of all life, and thus the Church, which is his Body, is concerned with all life. Indeed, all human life has its place within the Church. But we have far too readily distinguished between the sacred and the secular; have drawn too rigid lines between what we have thought was the Church's concern and what was not. It is no wonder that the life of mankind in the world has developed on lines so alien from the Gospel when the Church, the sphere of that Gospel's proclamation, has been so ready to devote herself exclusively to those facets of life strictly called "religious", and to exclude all others from her worship.

I am aware of the dangers of pushing such an ecclesiology too far. It is fatally easy, as is evident in certain aspects of the Roman Catholic liturgical movement, which have been justly castigated in Père Louis Bouyer's *Life and Liturgy*, for such a view to become Pelagian and to assume that man, by his own life and work, may contribute to his own salvation. But the opposite extreme seems to me equally dangerous, and to ignore the fact that God does call man,

[1] *Liturgical Renewal*, p. 53.

[2] *Liturgy and Society*, pp. 206–7.

not to contribute to, but to co-operate in, his own salvation and, further, to co-operate in his eternal work of creation in the world. When, therefore, I say that all human life has its place within the sphere of the Church, I mean all man's life as man—child of God and inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven—not his life as worldling. It is one thing to say that man is not saved by his works; it is quite another to say that his works have no place within the given sphere of salvation.

I believe it is this too rigid dichotomy which has hindered common worship being the true centre of parish life. The Church, both Catholic and Protestant, has in recent years become increasingly aware of this. We all know of the experiments made in the Roman Catholic Church to remedy the situation. Inevitably some of these experiments have been wild and unbalanced, and Roman authority has been quite right to check them; others seem to have restored to the Church a vitality which she has lacked since the medieval decline in common worship. I do not think it matters that some of the experiments have failed; I do think it important that they should continue. The danger in the Roman Catholic Church is that the failure of one or more experiments may lead to the suppression of all experimentation. We have a greater freedom, which carries with it both danger and responsibility.

The first point I would make about this is that any experiment in enlarging the scope of our worship must have a theological basis in our ecclesiology; must spring from our belief in the Church as the normal sphere of man's redemption, wherein he is made a member of Christ, is engrafted into his Mystical Body and thus made one with all who are so engrafted. It is the whole man, in the whole of his human life, who is thus "in Christ".

Secondly, the local parish is, as the local expression of the whole Body, the normal sphere where this takes place; and so, thirdly, the highest act of the local Body—the worship of the Eucharist—must be such that this oneness in Christ and with men is apparent.

It cannot be too often emphasized that the mere fact that a number of people are together in the same building during the celebration of the Eucharist does not necessarily mean that they are worshipping corporately. Our Anglican tradition, wherein a handful of the faithful come for an early celebration, while the bulk of the congregation comes later in the morning either for sung Matins or for a solemn celebration of the Eucharist at which the celebrant alone communicates, is deplorable, and cuts at the very roots of corporate worship. Under such a system the worshipping Body of Christ can never truly manifest itself. The "parish Communion" is a happy movement away from this, and in very few new parishes to-day is the old system followed.

I have said that the whole of man's life should be expressed in the highest act of worship. As we know, the Roman Catholic liturgical movement has sought to do this by an emphasis on the Offertory. So, for example, in Abbé Michonneau's parish, one has had representatives of various trades and professions making symbolic offer-

ings at this point. This is a harmless gesture, provided it is realized, as Dr E. L. Mascall has recently pointed out, that the Offertory is not part of the essential eucharistic action—"He took. He blessed, He brake, He gave".[1] In other words, provided it is realized that the essential eucharistic action is that of the Lord himself. It is in the action of the Head of the Body that the centrality of eucharistic worship lies, and thus it is not by man's act, but by his, that the whole of man's life, transformed by its assumption into him, is capable of being offered to the Father. An over-emphasis on the offertory procession, with the bringing to the holy table of the gifts of toil, which one finds in some Anglican and some Roman Catholic churches, may obscure this truth.

Although, as I have said, I am convinced that liturgical experiment must continue, I am by no means convinced that radical liturgical revisions are going to have the desired result of making people realize their solidarity in the Body of Christ, or of making worship the centre of their parish life. I think this is shown by a liturgy, called *An Experimental Liturgy*, published since I started to prepare this paper. In this liturgy, although the people are given a great deal to do—indeed, they are kept inordinately busy—the essential act seems to me to be obscured because, so far as one can see, basic theological principles are ignored.[2]

I believe that the ideal was expressed in the Report of the Editorial Committee of the Anglican Congress at Minneapolis in 1954, when they defined Anglican worship as "scriptural in theology, intelligible in language, and corporate in expression. It must be the ordered worship of the Church. In our worship we accept by faith God's gift of himself to us, and in praise, penitence and prayer we offer ourselves for his service, seeking to become instruments which he may use for the extension of his Kingdom."[3]

First, the worship is scriptural. It was from the renewal of the theological study of Scripture that there emerged the re-emphasis on the doctrine of the Church as the Mystical Body, with its repercussions in all spheres of Christian life.

It is on the lines of such study that I believe we may most fruitfully go forward in our common counsel together in the future, and also go forward in common counsel with our own faithful in our parishes. It is not for me here to suggest the ways in which we may best carry out this study with our own people, whether by the ordinary Bible class, by cells or other means. But I am concerned to say that such study must precede any real revival of common worship as I have tried to describe it.

That great, though erratic, liturgical scholar, the late Dom Gregory Dix, used to say that after the Reformation the Anglican liturgy remained in great part a service done by the clergy for the people, and that all that had essentially changed was the emphasis from the

[1] *The Recovery of Unity*, pp. 146–52.

[2] It is fair to say that this judgment is based on a reading of the text and not on the televised performance, which I did not see.

[3] Anglican Congress, *Report of Proceedings*, p. 197.

offering of the Sacrifice to the giving of Communion. This criticism is not entirely fair, but it has enough truth in it to make it uncomfortable. God does call particular members of Christ's Body to specific functions in that Body's worship, but he calls the whole Body to participate in it. I am quite sure that that means that the laity must have much more part than they normally have in its preparation. There has been published a good account of how this was done in one suburban parish in connexion with the services of Holy Week. The whole body of worshippers was brought into the preparation of those services, and consequently in the using of them was able to be a truly worshipping body.[1] In some English parishes the Sunday worship is carefully prepared at what is called the "parish meeting". Clearly, for those with fixed liturgical forms such common preparation cannot take the form of making alterations to the rite, but in parishes which have the regular weekly parish meeting one often finds an understanding of the rite, and of its corporate nature, which is too often lacking elsewhere. There is much besides the actual rite on which clergy and faithful may make up their minds together week by week.

There is one point of importance which I have omitted to mention, and yet one which is fundamental to this conception of common eucharistic worship—the place of the liturgical sermon. I mean specifically the liturgical sermon and not just a sermon which takes place during the liturgy. There is, of course, a place in the Church's life for prophetic preaching, for patient expository preaching and for the plain "teaching sermon", but I suggest that the Holy Eucharist is not normally that place. There the sermon has a different function, which is, in the words of a recent writer on the subject, to announce "the action of God which is to occur in and through the whole eucharistic action, including and culminating in the communion of the people".[2]

The rubric in our Anglican Prayer Book requires a sermon to be preached at every celebration of the Holy Communion. It does not require a sermon at any other time, though it appears to require an instruction (*didache* as opposed to *kerygma*) at the other offices. Where the parish Communion is the custom, this proper ministry of word and sacraments together has once more come into its own, and I believe it produces that balance necessary to ensure the truest worship. So it is that the community together is able to realize and to know the present Lord who, with his Body, offers to the eternal Father.

HENRY R. T. BRANDRETH, O.G.S.

---

[1] John T. Martin, *Christ our Passover: the Liturgical Observance of Holy Week*, passim.

[2] R. H. Fuller, *What is Liturgical Preaching?* pp. 50–1 and passim.

Pentecost, the Spirit, and John

THE work of rehabilitating the Fourth Gospel goes on apace, and those of us who have maintained an affectionate regard for the famous *Introduction* of Bishop Westcott have lately been more than encouraged.[1] For that reason, a recent American article[2] would have to be regarded as outmanned, outgunned, and routed. By the same token, the reviewer of Dr Davies' Bamptons in this periodical[3] is being a little querulous when he asks whether Dr Davies is prepared to accept the Johannine account of the Donation of the Spirit at the expense of Luke. In truth, from whatever vantage point Luke may have in the heavenlies, the casting of his work into the arena of discussion will be nothing new to him. That the author of Acts was no mean editor, that the combination of his sources was a work of superlative skill, is by no means to say that the work he did must be free from examination or accepted quite uncritically. It is possible to unravel two traditions of the Kerygma in Acts.[4] and there is the familiar despair over the differences of chronology between Acts and Paul.[5] Two versions of the Kerygma, a divergent treatment of Peter and Paul, two Christologies, the one elementary and the other Luke's own, and two versions of the journeys of Paul—it is hardly a matter for easy options either for or against the editor of Acts.

Notoriously, the Fourth Gospel has an account of the Donation of the Spirit which will hardly at all accord at any point with Acts 2. Even supposing that we dismiss summarily the suggestion of Lightfoot that the Spirit was "given" on the Cross (*παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα*, John 19. 30), the uncomfortable fact remains that there is a quite emphatic account of the Donation in John 20. 19–23 on the day of the Resurrection itself. Not only so, but the evangelist is at pains to let us have *two* time-notes of the event –the same day, the first day of the week. Again, the Donation of the Spirit and the Commission by the Lord are simultaneous in John and are not so in Acts. The problem is not new, and hands were long ago at work on the last chapter of Luke to make an uneasy union between that chapter and the Fourth Gospel.[6] It is not enough to make the Pentecost story an enabling gift of the Spirit, for both the beginning of Acts and the end of Luke's Gospel make of the apostles men going about their business with joy.

[1] Cf., e.g., W. F. Albright in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, 1956; L. Mowry, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Background for the Gospel of John", *Biblical Archaeologist*, 17, 1954; R. E. Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles", *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 17, 1955; and many others.

[2] E. L. Titus, "The Fourth Gospel and History", *Journal of Bible and Religion*, 24, 3, 1956.

[3] THEOLOGY, 61, 461, November 1958, pp. 481 f.

[4] Cf. C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching*, 1936, pp. 25 ff.; "Gnosis, Gnosticism and the New Testament", p. 65 (Casey) and "Acts and Eschatology", p. 304 (Cadbury), both in *The Background of the New Testament*, quoted above; A. Fridrichsen, *The Apostle and His Message*, Uppsala, 1947; R. Hawkins, "The Galatian Gospel", *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 59, 1940.

[5] Cf. C. J. Cadoux, "The Chronology of the Apostolic Age", *J.B.L.*, 56, 1937.

[6] See the manuscript evidence for Luke 24 36–end.

We may grant that the Fourth Gospel is concerned above all with the unity of the Messianic Act of God in Jesus, and it is only the leisured monotony of discourse and narrative which hides from us the quick succession of Passion, Resurrection-Exaltation, and Donation of the Spirit. The evangelist is emphatic that the Spirit was to be given when Jesus was "glorified" in the Passion. Supposing John to have been right in his recording of the events, what then is to be made of the Pentecost-pericope in Acts? Harnack could dismiss the account of Pentecost in Acts 2 as legend, preferring the incidents in chapter 4 instead, but if we do not feel compelled to be so drastic, what meaning do we attach to Acts 2 in the face of the evidence of the Fourth Gospel? I have elsewhere[1] argued that the account of the Exaltation of Messiah in Acts 1 is a *midrash* entered for purposes of Lukan Christology—and I suggest that in part that may be true of the Pentecost story. At first sight there might appear to be some support from the rabbinic texts for this thesis. The *Mishnah*, for example,[2] has a tradition that the world is to be judged at Passover and Pentecost, while in *The Midrash* there is an even more arresting suggestion for our purposes. In the Midrash Rabbah (*Genesis, Vayetz* LXX, 8) there is a connexion made between the three wells of Genesis 29. 1 and the three feasts of Passover, Pentecost and Tabernacles—because on all of those feasts there is an imbibing of the divine Spirit. Attractive though the parallel might be, it must be rejected out of hand, as the traditions embodied in the Mishnah and the Midrash give us no help to determine how old are those traditions. More than that, the editor of Acts is highly unlikely to have erected anything so impressive as Acts 2 on so slender a foundation.

Now comes light from another source. It is now established beyond any question that the calendar of the sectarians of Qumran made provision for an annual renewal of the New Covenant on the feast of Pentecost.[3] Space will not permit of an examination of all the possibilities that this produces. However, scholars have not been slow to indicate to us the many parallels which exist between the Lukan picture of the primitive church and the milieu of Qumran.[4] This much can be said briefly: the gathering of all the "camps" of the sectarians gives us a point of departure for Acts 2. 5, 9; the consciousness of Christians that they were living in the last days is also true of Qumran and its folk—and no one will deny that the New Covenant and the New Age are writ large on every page of the New Testament. If then we hold to the Johannine understanding of the Messianic Act as being a unity in time as well as in theology, what *Sitz im Leben*

[1] *Church Quarterly Review*, October–December 1957.

[2] Rosh ha-Shanah 1. 2.

[3] Cf. F. M. Cross, Jnr, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 1958, p. 164, n. 40. In fact, some very promising developments may be looked for on the basis of the sectarian calendar—including the unravelling of the problems of the Passion chronology. In this connexion, cf. J. A. Walther, "The Chronology of Passion Week", *J.B.L.*, 77, 2, 1958, where there is a very full bibliography. Prof. Driver has promised a further examination of all this.

[4] Cf. O. Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts", *J.B.L.*, 74, 2, 1955.

remains for Acts 2? Granted the thesis of Cullmann that the Jerusalem Church modelled itself on the only pattern to hand (that of Qumran), what is more likely than that it held a feast of Covenant-Renewal? And in the eschatological "mood" of the early days, an outpouring of the Spirit is easy to understand. Luke cannot think of any local community being established without a manifestation of the Spirit, and that Jerusalem should be an exception would be unthinkable. And if when he compiled the Acts, the local church of Jerusalem was no more, what could be better than to incorporate an account of a Covenant-Renewal when there was a manifestation of the Spirit? If it was almost a swansong, it was nevertheless a glorious one. It will be plain that the present writer does hold to the Johannine chronology of the Donation of the Spirit, and to him the account of Pentecost in Acts is not an account of the Birthday of the Church Universal so much as the foundation in the Spirit of the local community.

We are left with the problem of what *happened* at Pentecost, with all the attendant surmises about "glossolalia" and the like. Was there an outburst of speaking in foreign tongues?[1] Or simply an uprush of the enthusiasm one associates with revivalism? In a sense this is entirely another problem, though there has been made recently an attempt to get at its roots.[2] It will suffice to touch briefly on the thesis offered by Sirks. He claims that "tongues" (*γλώσσαι*) is best understood as meaning *interpretations*, "glosses" on the text; that the word used for "speaking" (*λαλεῖν*) does not commonly have the meaning of speaking in a wild and unordered way, but can, and does, mean ordered recitation of *pericopae*; that "other tongues" (*ἑτέραις γλώσσαις*) does not mean "speaking in different languages" but rather offering an opposed interpretation to the one commonly accepted. There was, he holds, a gathering of Diaspora Jews at Pentecost, who were taken aback by a choice of *pericopae* not only at variance with those of the feast, but being interpreted in a wholly new fashion—pointing to Jesus-Messiah. Sirks rightly observes that not only is there quite another word for "languages" in Acts 2 than *γλώσσαι* (*διαλέκτοι*), but also that the behaviour of Peter was anything but that of a man possessed.

Others must argue the merits of Sirks's case, but something on those lines appears to be indicated if we are to preserve the unity of the Messianic Act as seen by the Fourth Gospel. Those of us who prefer the austerities of the Common Prayer to the *macédoine* of enthusiasms in 1928 are nevertheless not very happy with the Proper Preface in either book. Perhaps there is much to be said for the Praefatio ad Canonem suggested by Fr Gibbard, S.S.J.E.[3]—a Preface which, like the Fourth Gospel, preserves the unity of God's act in his Messiah.

C. S. Mann.

[1] Cf. J. G. Davies, "Pentecost and Glossolalia", *J.T.S.* (n.s.), 3, 2, 1952.
[2] Cf. G. J. Sirks, "The Cinderella of Theology", *Harvard Theological Review*, 50, 2, 1957.
[3] Art. "The Pauline Mystery", in *Studies in Ephesians*, 1955.

Letter from Buganda

"The problem in Buganda, as in many parts of the world, is . . . how to be a third-generation church in a twentieth-century society. . . . A church in which the majority[1] of adult members are permanently excommunicated is a monstrosity which demands the most serious appraisal of basic assumptions." This is the crucial theme of John Taylor's very reasonably priced book[2]—the first of a series of field studies "in depth" of the younger churches to be undertaken on behalf of the International Missionary Council. The author was the much-loved principal of the Uganda diocesan theological college. Perhaps there is nobody else qualified—by linguistic ability, theological insight and loving understanding of the people whom he served—to have written this particular book; and it is a *must* for all who wish to understand what is really happening in the younger churches—the important things which are so often mysteriously missing from the missionary magazines.

Before I accept the editor's invitation to use it as a text for a letter from Buganda, perhaps I may get off my chest certain highly technical, and perhaps rather petulant, criticisms, which make no difference at all to the importance of the book as a whole. First, Luganda is, at its best, a difficult language to spell; if an author assures us in his introduction that he is going to use the new orthography in all but quotations from others, he should do so. Otherwise, those who have (what some would call) the misfortune to know it, will be irritated. Secondly, there are two statements of a medical character (pp. 163, 186) for which I can find no specialist support. Thirdly, two at least of his dates are wrong: Yoswa KATE (p. 264) returned from exile to die at home in 1942; Samwiri MUKASA (p. 269) did not become Kangawo till after the signing of the Uganda (i.e. Buganda) Agreement in 1900. To students of Kiganda history this difference of one year is of some importance. Fourthly, I am not wholly happy about his description of traditional Kiganda religion (Chapters 10 and 11). This is no doubt due, in part, to the fact that there are considerable differences from one part of the country to another; and to the defective accounts which are, at the best, now available. But I cannot understand how he has missed the distinction between what he calls the dynastic *balubaale* and the *misambwa* of the clans—a distinction which I am coming to regard as essential to an understanding not only of "the Traditional World-View" but—more importantly—of the whole social structure of which that view is a part.

The author's facts—in so far as most of them are based on his own very careful observation, not only during his time as a theological principal, but over rather more than three months spent in three Anglican parishes in Buganda—are unassailable. They present a

[1] Eighty-seven per cent of men and 80 per cent of women in a church of 311,000 (24 per cent of the total population of Buganda).

[2] *The Growth of the Church in Buganda*, S.C.M. Press, 25s.

picture of a church still struggling to discover what the Church is and how it should adapt itself, on the one hand to its tribal background, on the other to the demands of the Western civilization which is an inevitable companion of the gospel. In this context he has some important observations, and judgments, of the much-discussed Revival movement. My hope is that readers of this letter will read the whole book; for me to try to select would be to distort the total picture of failure and triumph which it portrays. The purpose of what follows is both to stimulate interest in the Church in Buganda and to suggest an interpretation which I believe to be more fundamental than that given in the book, and essential to all who are concerned, whether as missionaries or as statesmen, with the future of East Africa.

John Taylor interprets his facts in terms of a conflict between two metaphysical systems: the African (which is in many ways closer to that of the Bible), in which every event is shot through and through with an awareness of a monistic personal will at work, expressing itself in belief in a pantheon of gods or spirits and the widespread use of sorcerers, charms and diviners; and the Western, with its concept of one all-powerful transcendent God, understood by Africans (which is not at all the same as saying, presented by missionaries) as largely removed from everyday affairs and implying an essential dualism. This conflict undoubtedly exists; but it exists also in England. There is nothing less of the "traditional world-view" in the spiritualistic medium than in the *musamizi* of Buganda, in the promiscuous use of aspirin than in the abstention from salt during pregnancy; metaphysically there is very little difference between a neurosis and spirit-possession—it is simply that, in a different environment, their cure demands a different method of communication between doctor and patient. The metaphysical approach is inadequate; it is necessary to understand that the important spiritual conflicts in East Africa to-day are at the political level; and it is at this level that significant spiritual decision must be made.

In Kenya, Jomo Kenyatta has now been raised to the level of "our beloved leader". Few Kenyans would to-day approve the methods of Mau Mau (there is, indeed, a historical doubt whether Kenyatta himself approved them); but most (and here I include my most intimate and Christian friends among the Agikuyu) regard him as the one man who has made a positive effort to realize their nationalist aspirations. In the past the Church has been the midwife of new nations; to-day she is bedevilled by her association with imperialism and has lost her job. But nationalism must have its religious symbols; and Kenyatta is all the more effective as a symbol because, like the God of the Christians, he is kept invisible in an imperialist detention camp. Humanly speaking, there is no hope for the Church in Kenya unless it can free itself of its political bonds; and Christians have to demonstrate, in action as well as word, that they are neither black nor white but members of the third race of men.

In Buganda the struggle is not yet essentially between black and white but between two conflicting patterns in Kiganda society itself.

The original Buganda consisted of largely independent clans under their *bataka*—clan heads—and finding supernatural aid from the clan *misambwa*. On to this society an alien dynasty of kings (*Kabaka*) imposed a centralized government with administrative chiefs—*bakungu*—appointed by the *Kabaka*; at the same time they probably introduced the national gods—*balubaale*; and the *Kabaka* made terms with the *bataka* by becoming *Ssabataka*—chief of the clan heads. But the *bataka* retained a high degree of importance in daily life—in marriage, birth, inheritance and the settlement of civil disputes within the clan.

To a large extent they seem to have become also priests of the new *balubaale*. The whole history of the kabakaship seems to indicate a deliberate separation of the administrative from the religious and personal aspects of society. The *Kabaka* kept his fingers in both pies and could always appeal to the *bataka* as a third force against the growing strength of his *bakungu*; but the ordinary Muganda belonged, *at one and the same time*, to both patterns—dependent on the *bakungu* for law and order, on the *bataka* for his more personal concerns.

When the first missionaries arrived in 1877, the *Kabaka* deliberately kept them under his eye at court. By so doing he determined, unwittingly, that the future rulers of the country should be Christian, using his successor as no more than their pawn: and at one time it appeared that Buganda had been converted almost overnight. Buganda was ready for change; and the dynamic factor, introduced at the same time by the Christian God and British administration, provided the necessary incentive. Although the typescript *History* by James Miti, now available in the libraries of the School of Oriental and African Studies and Makerere College, reveals that some of the early Christian leaders were nothing but toughs, it also gives an account, far more moving than that of the missionaries, of the devotion of the martyrs; and the leaders—both Anglican and Roman Catholic, the same men regarding themselves as responsible for both Church and State—felt genuinely *Tewali kudda nnyuma*. There is no turning back: the new Buganda was to be Christian in intention and modern in technique. The *balubaale*, because their temples were public, could readily be dismissed; the *misambwa* of the clans, living in caves and trees and rivers and swarms of bees, were more viable. The *Kabaka*, although needed as a concession to such of the old pattern as was still active, was no more than functional to the new scheme of the *bakungu*; and what an embarrassment he could be was shown when Mwanga led a pagan reaction in 1897 and, thirty years later, his son proved too progressive for the original leaders, now grown old.

But the same policy of keeping the missionaries at court meant that the *bataka* pattern was untouched by the new forces. It was they who, because they guarded the ancestral grave-lands, felt most keenly the sacred character of the earth; they for whom Buganda must always be Buganda, who would lose their identity if it were absorbed in a larger whole; they who continued in secret the cult of the

misambwa; they for whom the *Kabaka* had become necessary as ritual head (so that one of them could say to me recently, "We do not like the 1955 Agreement because it reduces the power of the *Kabaka* and therefore reduces our power"); they who, because of their deeply grounded functions in the personal life of Buganda, continued to control the thoughts and actions of the majority of the people. When, in 1900, freehold land titles were first introduced, a deliberate attempt was made, by overriding the traditional *bataka* holdings, to break their power. But they still retained their control of inheritance; and the young man of to-day, who wishes to inherit land given to his grandfather by the *bakungu*, must ensure that he is on the right side of the *bataka*.

In the *Uganda Church Review* for winter 1958, a courageous attempt is made by an African Christian to analyse this conflict in terms of the Haves (land, education) and the Have-nots. But this does not go far enough; it does not, for instance, explain why Kate and Mukasa, mentioned in an earlier paragraph—both of them Haves and both deeply Christian—eventually threw all their political force behind the Have-nots. I want to suggest that the clue to the understanding of what is now happening, in both Church and State in Buganda, is the conflict, not perhaps so much between observable institutions as in the minds of individuals, between the *bakungu* pattern, redirected to a Christian intention and committed to integration with the larger world, and the *bataka* pattern, for which Buganda must always be Buganda and the old gods restored if Christianity proves to be too progressive. It is the latter pattern which (perhaps because of our political ineptness in deporting the *Kabaka* in 1953) is at present dominant. It is not clear that anybody but the *Kabaka* can restore the former, and that perhaps is not in his interest.

This is a tension which it is relatively easy to see in Buganda. But there are signs all over East Africa that the same forces, modified by local conditions, are at work. There is tribalism, which always means a rejection of Christ; and there is the possibility of entering into a larger world, which might be Christian if European Christians were also ready to enter into it. It is surely tribalism of the most rigid kind which is described by *Forum*,[1] when it writes, of Europeans in Kenya, "even so-called liberals . . . think of democracy merely as a way of 'preserving civilized standards' . . . they are hanging on to political positions, the original justification for which they have lost touch with".

F. B. Welbourn.

[1] February 1959, Box 8121, Nairobi, Kenya, monthly, 10s. for six months (airmail 13s.).

Christian Community or Community of Christians?

To-day there is a great deal of discussion about the "world mission" of the Church and the relation of "Missions" to that "mission". A significant stage in this debate is marked by the recent Assembly of the International Missionary Council held in Ghana (for the first time in Africa!) just a year ago.[1] One of the main questions to be considered was the merger with the World Council of Churches. There was a good deal of heart-searching on both sides. Simple pietists with a great zeal for evangelism felt that their concern might be lost in the ecclesiastical atmosphere of the W.C.C. Churchmen, especially the Greek Orthodox, felt a real distaste for a merger which might bring them in association with groups which showed signs of proselytizing members of ancient churches.

The speeches and papers delivered reflect something of the confusion and even demoralization which has seized the missionary movement. It is easy to forget the embarrassingly close connexion that there is between the missionary movement and the imperialism of Western countries. Obviously this was bound to have its repercussions when the Church found itself in the midst of new nationalisms and of communism, which often utilized such national feeling and the resurgence of ancient faiths. Thus, in China it had the effect of the Christians themselves asking the missionaries to go; in Ceylon nationalism is bound up with the resurgence of Buddhism: Indonesia, having freed itself from Dutch rule, appears as a great Muslim power: and the new upsurge of national feeling in the Middle East is not without significance for the growth and self-consciousness of Islam.

The missionary can no longer be protected by the arms or the prestige of an imperial power, and some even ask whether he has any right to exist at all! The missionaries took the converts they made out of their natural environment, so that only too often they became aliens to their own country, strangers to their former culture. This may have been inevitable in so far as that culture was impregnated with a religious outlook, but it was very dangerous. So long as great prestige attached to the foreign ruling power the position of the "native" Christians was somewhat favoured and they often prospered. This is most interestingly discussed by Dr Kraemer in the book recently published by the S.C.M. Press—a translation of reports written by him to the Dutch Mission Board in the period before the war. It bears the significant title *From Mission Field to Independent Church*.[2] Kraemer is known for his uncompromising hostility to any tendency to religious syncretism or compromise, but less known is his superb grasp of what might be called cultural anthropology. The

[1] *Ghana Assembly of the International Missionary Council*. Edited by R. K. Orchard (Edinburgh House Press, 12s. 6d.).

[2] *From Mission Field to Independent Church*. By Hendrik Kraemer (S.C.M. Press, 28s.).

book is of absorbing interest and missionary statesmen might learn many warnings from it.

One problem is worth mentioning. Out of the labours of missionaries a Christian group arises and eventually a Church. Perhaps the main purpose of the mission is to found the Church. Having founded the Church, is the Mission to die or at least, like John the Baptist, to "decrease"? But the young Church is also faced with great problems. By the nature of its background it has a dangerous tendency to isolation. It seems foreign to its fellow-citizens in new self-conscious nations. This problem, particularly urgent in India, deserves serious theological and sociological study. The phrase "the Christian Community" means something in India and possibly elsewhere in ASIA strange to Western minds. It means a closed community, set apart by its own customs, beliefs and rules about marriage. It easily conforms to the Hindu idea of caste. Christian converts who will have nothing to do with the overt religions from which they have come may none the less retain certain social customs. Here the phrase "Christian Community" is significant. The ancient Syrian Church in Kerala, South India, is a good example. It has never depended upon foreign missions and their appearance led to schisms within the Church, but it has existed for centuries almost as a caste in a Hindu environment; endogamous, marriage outside the community has been rare and disapproved, with many customs derived from Hindu neighbours, its worship—very splendid—is East Syrian. In the Islamized world of the Near and Middle East the Church survives as a "millet", a community defined by birth and structure. Such a "Christian Community" will be acceptable enough to non-Christian neighbours, but it is a denial of the nature of the Church. Pietism cannot help in this situation, but only a very profound sociology and ecclesiology. For the Church is the community of Christians called by God to proclaim the Gospel, to evangelize, to bring under the sovereignty and judgment of God the natural community or area of common living in which Christians and non-Christians alike must live. In India the government sponsoring of "community projects" suggests a new understanding of the word community as opposed to the old communalism which splits the nation vertically into closed religious groups defined by birth. Here is the dynamic possibility in the development of the notion of a secular state. Christians should work out the implications of this and provide a new leadership.

Despite the many problems presented by outworn social structure and the effects of imperialism in the lands of new nations the Church, too, has come of age and the Mission Field has become the Independent Church. This constitutes one of the issues which confronted the Ghana Assembly. What is the role, if any, of the missionary in the Churches of Asia and Africa? Can the Mission Board give way to the conception of Inter-Church Aid? How can the Churches of the West best help what should no longer be called "the younger churches"?

One thing is certain, the whole world is a mission-field and the community of Christians is now world-wide. The world is becoming

both smaller and greater: smaller in the sense of vastly improved communications, larger because it is no longer possible to be provincial. There are some analogies between our age and the hellenistic. If Christianity has spread to the ends of the earth and is recovering an ecumenical vision, other faiths are awaking from sleep and claiming adherents in the West.

Two books provide interesting study of the impact of two faiths or cultures on one another. Carsun Chang's learned study of Neo-Confucianism[1] shows how the antique Confucian culture became adapted and revived as the result of the impact of Buddhism and Taoism. The emergence of China as a great power, and perhaps the greatest power in a few centuries, makes one ask if this traditional philosophy with its humanism and its ethical concern for human relations will be utterly submerged by communism or rather shape communism in its ultimate Chinese form.

The Neo-Confucians began their reappraisal in the eighth century and flourished vigorously in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. At the same time, Arab philosophers were endeavouring to integrate the Semitic and Muslim conception of Revelation with Greek Wisdom. F. Rahman, in his *Prophecy in Islam*,[2] has written an original study of this important subject. We, too, have entered a period at which rival systems of thought once more confront one another. Can this stimulate a new integration and a new power of the spirit to tame and to guide the mighty power let loose by technology? This is surely a time of agonizing reappraisal.

The Jews survive in the world as a community in the sense we have discussed and try to solve their problems in Israel by once more becoming a nation, but their most sensitive souls still see in Judaism a spiritual mission to the world. *Between East and West*,[3] a beautifully produced volume of essays, is dedicated to the memory of Bela Horowitz, who started the East and West Library. One of the contributors is Martin Buber. He returns to his old study of Hasidism, and points out its tendency to overcome the fundamental division between the sacred and the profane. "Everywhere the sacred is removed and set apart from the abundance of things, qualities and actions which belongs to the generality of everyday life. It forms in its totality an enclosed sanctuary in which profane elements can make no entry . . . but in Hasidism . . . the profane is looked upon only as a preparatory stage of the sacred . . . man's life is intended to be hallowed in all its natural structure . . . God dwells where he is let in." This whole essay deserves study and provides a valuable insight into the problem of community which we have mentioned. A little book by the late Rabbi Leo Baeck[4] is likewise a noble account of the basic tenets of Judaism. A saintly man who endured a martyrdom in a concentration camp can speak to us with authority.

[1] *Neo-Confucian Thought*. By Carson Chang (Vision Press, 50s.).
[2] *Prophecy in Islam*. By F. Rahman (Allen and Unwin, 15s.).
[3] *Between East and West*. Ed. A. Altmann (East and West Library, 30s.).
[4] *God and Man in Judaism*. By Leo Baeck (Valentine, Mitchell, 6s.).

There are many competing faiths to-day and the Church exists in a new situation, but remains as the people of God called to redeem the world, not by becoming an isolated community but "a suffering servant". The proposed merger of the I.C.C. and the W.C.C. will be creative if it reminds churches that they are servants of the plan of God for the world, called not to be introspective and concerned only with their own inner community but going out to the frontier. Similarly, the missions are challenged to face afresh the social and cultural issues of our time. J. A. Mackay's address at the Assembly is prophetic in this respect.

LEONARD M. SCHIFF.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. F. A. Simpson is a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

The Rev. H. R. T. Brandreth is Chaplain of St George's Church, Paris.

The Rev. C. S. Mann is a Religious of Nashdom Abbey.

The Rev. F. B. Welbourn is Warden of Mitchell Hall, Makerere College.

The Rev. L. M. Schiff has recently been appointed a Fellow of St Augustine's College, Canterbury.

CORRESPONDENCE

TRAINING FOR THE MINISTRY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I was very interested in the article in your February issue by the Principal of Cuddesdon Theological College. It is a feature of the present system that whatever a man's previous experience or background he is required, if under forty, to undergo a practically standard two-year period of training in a recognized college. Some men are married; others are single. Some have previous experience of work in either a factory or office or in the forces; others are young and inexperienced. Some have been lay readers for several years; others have been confirmed but recently. Some have read an arts or science degree at university; others have done no academic work for many years; others, again, have read theology as a consciously intended part of their training. For a few, prayer has been a serious discipline for some while; for others, such an approach to prayer is both new and strange. But not only have ordinands different backgrounds. They may well also be training for different ministries. Some may be called to be parish priests in either town or country. Some may be intending to work abroad. Some may feel called to teach theology, to teach in a school, to do psychiatric work in a hospital or prison, to work as an industrial chaplain. The disadvantages of a system which treats such different people alike are obvious.

I should like in this letter to make a few suggestions with regard to the training of those who already have honours degrees in theology.

Our theological colleges, as at present organized, seek to train men, as the Rev. E. G. Knapp-Fisher very rightly says, not *only* academically but spiritually. No one I think should question the vital necessity of teaching, or rather of giving a man the opportunity of learning, a habit of prayer and reflection. It is most important, and is something which a person who already has a theology degree still usually needs. He most often, however, only requires a little further *academic* training, and therefore finds himself at college studying much less hard than has been his habit at university, and studying moreover, very frequently, things that he thinks unimportant and irrelevant to his ministry. To this it is answered that anyone is free to work as hard as he likes, and to read, within certain limits, whatever he likes. I would reply that the crowded college program in fact so breaks up the day that sustained study is extremely difficult, and, secondly, that in any case some men are in no mood for any further study. They have just spent three whole years studying theology full time with a view to ordination, and they are more than ready for a measure of "involvement". For such people to spend two more years at a theological college, possibly in the artificial atmosphere of a university town, merely leads to very considerable frustration. Not only is it a great waste of time, but it puts them in quite the wrong mood for learning that discipline of prayer which we all agree to be so necessary. It becomes very difficult to be relaxed and attentive when there is the knowledge that the main part of one's day is not being profitably spent. A man who has perhaps a third in theology, and whose interests and concern lie elsewhere, neither wants to write a thesis as suggested, or indeed to continue with academic theology at all.

What, then, is my suggestion? It is that some such men might benefit from a year at one of our present colleges, but that for most, what would be much more valuable would be a period of one or two years spent living together in community in an industrial area. All would share a common and disciplined life of prayer, and during the day might do a variety of things which would broaden their experience, and increase their sensitivity and love for men. Such activities might include labouring in a factory, teaching in a day school, working in a hospital, running a youth club, or helping in a parish. One incidental advantage would be the ending of the present absurdly long vacations. Yet another would be that priests, who are not qualified academically to lecture, might still play a very valuable part pastorally in the training of ordinands.

Above all let each man be considered separately, and let him have some say both as to the extent and nature of his post-graduate training. No one wishes to shirk either work or prayer, and I can see nothing to be said for indiscriminately prescribing for all alike. At the moment we are coming out like sausages. If ordinands knew at the beginning of their university careers that the present five-year scheme of training was not inevitable, then more might read theo-

logy, and more also might consider the nature of their vocation and its implications at an earlier stage. If this letter is nothing else it is a plea that we shall be consulted.

If I had the space to write more I should like to expand my more positive suggestions, as they are deeply felt and carefully considered. May I conclude with the hope that you will continue to give much space in your review to this problem, as it is of the very greatest importance?

Yours sincerely,

Lincoln Theological College. Richard Butler.

PSALMS IN WORSHIP

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

As Mr Whittaker says in your March number, the restoration of Psalmody to the English Eucharist is a desirable purpose. I would add that it is desirable also because it enriches in a way the use of hymns alone does not. Also attendance at Mattins and Evensong being not what it was, there is a tendency for people to become unfamiliar with the psalms.

The reasons for using a psalm for the Gradual rather than for the Introit are certainly interesting, but I would add a purely practical though mundane reason. While English Christianity is to be seen in cathedrals and the great churches with trained and expert choirs, it is also to be seen in country village and down-town churches whose choirs are adequate and willing but not always expert. I have found that to sing a psalm at nine o'clock in the morning as the very first item is not always easy and the result not often pleasing. At that point a well-known, short and low-pitched hymn is desirable. By the time the Gradual comes we are all much more able to sing a psalm worthily. There are about sixteen psalms that are suitable for this. We used to have a psalm at the Introit but gave it up in favour of the Gradual, where it is a much greater success.

Yours faithfully,

Sambrook Vicarage,
Newport, Salop. J. Basil Morson.

A COMMON LECTIONARY AND LITURGY?

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

I was glad to read Mr A. H. Dammers' article (Theology, March 1959, pp. 89 ff.) advocating a Common Lectionary and a Common Liturgy for the Church of England and the historic Free Churches. If such an invitation as he suggests were given by the Church of England I hope that it would meet with an encouraging response. I believe that there are many Free Churchmen who would welcome it.

The increasing observance of the Christian Year (not only of major

festivals but also of seasons) in Free Church worship makes it not merely desirable but almost inevitable that we should have a lectionary, at least as a general guide. A number of lectionaries have been produced: I suspect that they would be more widely used if they were of greater merit. Other lectionaries will no doubt be produced: if they are really good they will win a growing acceptance.

This is why I believe that the time has come when Anglicans and Free Churchmen could work together with real hope of producing a Common Lectionary that would prove widely acceptable. We read the same Bible (with the possible exception of the Apocrypha) and we observe the same Christian Year (at least in its essential outline). Before long we shall have a new translation of the Bible, which will itself be the work of scholars drawn from our various churches. Can we not now take the next step and agree about the way in which the Bible should be read in our services?

The production of a Common Liturgy no doubt raises greater problems; but I suspect that it is not as impossible as it might seem. A comparison of the orders used in the Church of England and the Free Churches, as well as much that has been written on both sides, reveals a large measure of agreement on the structure and essential contents of the order for the Lord's Supper. With the notable example of the C.S.I. Liturgy before us, it looks as if the production of a Common Liturgy would be possible in the not too distant future. As in the case of a Common Lectionary, if it was good enough it would certainly win a growing acceptance in the Free Churches.

Is it not along such lines as these that we could most fittingly celebrate the tercentenary of 1662?

Yours sincerely,

Emmanuel Congregational Church,
West Wickham, Kent.

James M. Todd.

CHRISTIANITY AND CULTURE IN AFRICA

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

"Letter from South Africa" in your January issue seems to be of exceptional interest and importance. It deserves, as it solicits, discussion; and not only from those specially concerned about South Africa. Let me for brevity's sake select only two points.

(1) It is doubtful if Dr Shropshire's book typically represents the "catholic" approach to missionary strategy. For instance, Dr L. S. Thornton, whose primary interest is in biblical theology, insists that the essence of the divine revelation upon which catholic Christianity is built cannot be disentangled from the human culture (or cultures) which have influenced the presentation of that revelation in the Bible. That, surely, is the point of the title he has given to his recent series of books, *The Form of the Servant*.

Again, "catholics" in reunion conferences are wont to insist that so-called "catholic accretions" cannot be stripped away to disclose the essence of our religion; that such procedure would be analogous to peeling an onion to find its core—which it hasn't got!

As a theological lecturer to African ordinands, I would not care if they wore blankets, or even loin-cloths, instead of trousers; but I am sufficiently a disciple of Dr Thornton to be unable to impart Christian doctrine or Church history minus their trappings (question-begging word) of European culture.

(2) We South Africans are bursting to tell Dr Hinchliffe something which he already knows as well as we do: that it is very doubtful if our social anthropologists, with all the help promised by our pro-apartheid Government, will manage to preserve even what remains of the "Ming vase" of primitive African culture. There is an ever-increasing number of "westernized" Africans who are saying: "We do not *want* African culture; it is stagnant. We want European culture." And in the urban locations, on which our Government ineffectually frowns, a new culture flourishes which is not, in fact, the European culture which it apes, but neither is it the African culture from which in part it derives. It is a vigorous, growing thing—more worthy perhaps of being called "culture" than anything that has yet appeared on the Anglo-Boer side of the apartheid division. You may soon have an opportunity of seeing in London a "jazz opera" entitled *King Kong*. It is the very first theatrical production with a cast of native South Africans, the composer of the music being a "native" too. At present it is playing to quite full houses, white and black mixed, at the University theatre in Johannesburg. It should not be missed.

Yours sincerely,

St Peter's Theological College,
Rosettenville, Johannesburg.

G. P. H. Pawson, C.R.

THE MINISTRY OF HEARING

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

A few years ago I constantly found myself wanting to end my sermon with the words "Let us pray": finally, one day, I did so, producing what I presume may be called an affective prayer based on the sermon. I have done this frequently since, and I find, and other priests who have done the same also find, that it helps people very much. I believe it helps them to digest the sermon, and probably it may lead to some sort of resolution.

It is a good discipline for the preacher, because if he is going to talk to God out loud about the subject of his sermon, then he must be quite sure of what his sermon is about and what he wants it to do.

I have discussed this practice with others, and I know that a number of priests are following it.

This experience may possibly be germane to the article on "The Ministry of Hearing" in your February number.

Yours sincerely,

Bishop Gray College,
Cape Town.

Thomas, O.S.B. Oblate.
Chaplain.

BOOK REVIEWS

HUMAN CULTURE AND THE HOLY. By Jaroslav Pelikan. S.C.M. Press. 15s.

How far, or in what way, is God to be identified with those "absolute" values of truth, goodness and beauty in which most philosophers have found the significance and essential worth of human life? If, indeed, the idea of God is to mean aught to us—to be intelligible, that is, in terms of human experience—are we not bound to describe him in a manner for which reason and conscience provide the only admissible criteria? In Christian thought such questions as these have commonly received an answer unhesitatingly affirmative. Today, however, with the chequered record of our human valuations behind us, we are less sure. *Num enim cogitationes meae, cogitationes vestrae, neque viae vestrae viae meae.* Our philosophy, we suspect, has betrayed us into supposing that the divine is no more than, in Barth's contemptuous phrase, "a corrected continuation" of the human. Yet if this be so, how is God known to us, even by revelation?

It is to this problem that Dr Jaroslav Pelikan addresses himself. He shows how the effort to "ensnare" the Holy within the meshes of our man-made concepts has blinded us to its otherness. "The history of Christian theology", he contends, "is replete with examples of the tendency to make faith equivalent to the acceptance of a set of truths." The Holy is tamed to the requirements of a schematic intellectualism. We owe it to Kierkegaard that now at last we can see through this pretension. So, too, with the "good". Here the identification is no less dangerous and in modern times perhaps more frequent. "It is the danger confronting anyone who devotes himself to the implications of the Christian faith for the problem of life rather than thought"; and its price may be a sterile moralism. Yet through a Dostoevsky we once more may learn that sin is not primarily a moral but a religious fact. What, however, in Dr Pelikan's view is in many ways the subtlest and most appealing of the attempts to domesticate the Holy lies in aestheticism, a response to the fascination of the "beautiful", with its manifold expression in art. For art, as Nietzsche saw it, is a *Mittelwelt*, sufficiently veiling "a terrible and awesome reality" to make its presence tolerable. But Nietzsche, after falling prey (who at times does not?) to the traumatic sensualism of Wagner, perceived in his later years how "demonic" the identification of the Holy and the beautiful might be. It could become a mask for the will-to-power. Though to the end he refused to be called a Christian, Nietzsche took seriously the Christian assertion that without Christ life is meaningless and without God hopeless.

Are our values, then, merely a deception, and does the Holy remain an enigma before which thought retreats in confusion? Not so. All values are revaluated in Christ; and the remainder of Dr Pelikan's book is devoted to showing how. Truth, he believes, is discovered *through* the Holy, given, as St Paul found, "in the know-

ledge of God's mystery", Christ, who is the *locus*, for faith, of all understanding. Similarly, as Martin Luther came to learn, we do not achieve the Holy through the good, with its implication of merit acquired by moral exertion, but the good through the Holy. The Church, for example, is "holy", a communion of saints, not from the virtues of its members but because it lives by the forgiveness of sins. And beauty? This also is disclosed by the Holy; and Dr Pelikan brings J. S. Bach to witness. Bach's faith transfigured his art. (Note, for instance, how in Church Cantata No. 161 he uses the chorale melody "Herzlich tut's mich verlangen" "to change a baroque assertion of the liberation of the soul from the body into a more profoundly Christian impression than the text would permit".)

St Paul, Luther, Bach: the bare names of Dr Pelikan's heroes are enough to declare the tradition of his thinking. But his argument is tellingly marshalled, with an impressive documentation from modern German authors. As is commonly the case, his criticism of the faults he denounces is rather more convincing than the thesis he expounds. But he surely is right in holding that a Christian valuation of life must be radical and not simply a pious consecration of the assumptions of humanism. Dr Pelikan, who is Professor of Historical Theology in the Federated Theological Faculty at Chicago University, writes, despite his (evidently) central European background and transatlantic domicile, an unobtrusive and readable English. Misprints are very few, but "seventeenth century" on p. 58, l. 3, should presumably read "eighteenth century".

Kelly Rectory,
Lifton, Devon.

B. M. G. Reardon.

The Gnostic Problem. By R. McL. Wilson. Mowbrays. 35s.

This is a useful and well-written work which fills the obvious need for an up-to-date study in English on Gnosticism. It does not pretend to be a full-scale study of the Gnostic movement, for, as the author quite rightly points out, this could not be undertaken until all the documents found in the cemetery at Nag-Hammadi have been examined and published. However, the current view of the Jewish background to Gnosticism could be tested more thoroughly. This is what the author has set out to do, and he has done it successfully.

He starts with a discussion of the various religious ideas prevalent among the Jews of the Dispersion, and sees in them one of the main starting-points for the development of Gnosticism. He discusses the gnosticizing elements in the thought of St Paul and Philo and relates these to the emergence of the Gnostic sects in the second century as a challenge to Christian orthodoxy. There is a useful chapter in which the author discusses the importance of *Apocryphon Joannis* and the *Evangelium Veritatis* which form part of the Jung Codex. In addition, the reader is presented with a formidable critical apparatus containing a great deal of useful information and, perhaps even more important, useful references.

If anything, the author has been perhaps too careful, too anxious

not to stray beyond the strict limits which he has set for himself. Few, for instance, would quarrel with his conclusion that Gnosticism was an atmosphere rather than a creed, and "in the broadest sense it is a tendency of the period which saw the birth of Christianity" (p. 263). Of the strongly, perhaps even predominantly, Jewish influences also there can be no reasonable doubt. As the writer of *The Treatise on the Three Natures* (found at Nag-Hammadi) points out, "The Greek philosophers did not possess the possibility of knowing the cause of existing things because this was not communicated to them". (F. L. Cross, ed., *The Jung Codex*, p. 59.) Instead, he himself discusses themes common in St Paul, such as the problem of death in life and the Resurrection-life in Christ. Basilides, too, was preoccupied with questions which would interest only Jews or Christians, such as the relationship between sin and the martyr's death. As Irenaeus remarked about his followers, they declared that "they had ceased to be Jews, but not yet become Christians" (*Adv. Haereses*, 1, 24, 6). For many Gnostics Judaism remained the norm.

But that is not by any means the whole story. We have Origen's formal assertion, *Contra Celsum*, iii, 12, that serious interest in Christianity among "many scholars among the Greeks" provoked the emergence of the multitude of sects during the second century. It would have been very interesting if Dr Wilson could have shown how Iranian, Greek and Jewish influences were intermingling to produce the extraordinary movement which Celsus and Irenaeus were describing. Lietzmann's brilliant chapter on Gnosis in Vol. I of the *Geschichte der alten Kirche*, might perhaps have suggested a line of approach. The similarities and contrasts, for instance, between Mithraism and Gnosticism were something that impressed contemporaries (*Contra Celsum*, vi, 22–4). It is interesting to find both these religions spreading through the Mediterranean provinces of the Empire at the same period. The author might also have derived stimulus from Carcopino's discussion of Pythagorean influences on the Roman Gnostics, suggested by the paintings on the walls of the catacomb below the Viale Manzoni. The questions, however, which he has set out to answer on the extent of Hellenistic-Jewish influences in Gnosticism, and how far one can think in terms of a pre-Christian Gnostic movement are relevant enough. He has made good use of Dodd's discussion of the Egyptian Hermetic material. He has valuable cautionary comments on those who would find the *Manual of Discipline* of the Dead Sea sect yet another Gnostic source-book. But Gnosticism, if not a "new world religion" (G. Quispel, *Gnosis als Weltreligion*, 1951, p. 1), was one of the predominant influences in the Mediterranean world during the two and a half centuries A.D. There is still room for a comprehensive work using both the new archaeological and literary sources. Dr Wilson's study is an extremely valuable contribution on one important aspect of this movement. It will be indispensable to teachers and students of the religious thought of the period.

W. H. C. Frend.

Gonville and Caius College,
Cambridge.

THE CISTERCIAN HERITAGE. By L. Bouyer. Mowbray. 22s. 6d.

This work is an admirably lucid and careful translation of a revised version of Fr Bouyer's *La Spiritualité de Cîteaux*. Although a good deal of work on the early history of Cistercianism has been effected on the Continent in recent years, notably in France, very little of it has crossed the Channel, and because of this and of the quality of Fr Bouyer's work, this book is well worthy of a place on the shelves of those seriously interested in the history of medieval Western piety.

A brief but very stimulating introduction draws interesting parallels between the age of St Bernard and the present day. It is followed by eight essays on early Cistercianism. Fr Bouyer is not a medieval historian by trade, and because of this the first of these ("The origins of Cistercian Spirituality") is not completely convincing. The middle ages, like earlier and later periods, suffered severely from an inability to think in evolutionary terms, despite a certain freedom of movement resulting from their own intellectual ingenuity and the haziness of contemporary historical knowledge. Only against this background can any medieval reform movement be fully comprehended, and Fr Bouyer gives it sufficient attention. All the other essays are of value on a variety of counts. They present very attractively the results of a good deal of patient research insufficiently known outside France, and make most interesting use of modern psychology to interpret early Cistercian piety. Pride of place must be given to the two essays on St Bernard, which brush away a number of antique cobwebs and provide a reassessment of his spirituality which should be made compulsory reading for all those engaged in lecturing on the saint. The two essays which follow—on William of St Thierry—are notable for the light they shed on a figure whose contribution to early Cistercianism the past most grossly underestimated.

As Fr Bouyer points out, "Anglo-Saxons play an important part in the history of Cîteaux". None of them was more loved or more influential than St Aelred of Rievaulx. Fr Bouyer's essay on him is an invaluable pendant to the definitive historical work which Sir Maurice Powicke carried to a triumphant a conclusion in his recent edition of Walter Daniel's *Life of Ailred*.[1] The penultimate essay deals with the Englishman Isaac of Stella, "the great mystery among the Cistercians", who "more than any of his contemporaries gives us the impression of being remarkably alive" (p. 161), the last one with Guerric of Igny of whom "the only act which has been preserved about his life is that on his deathbed he demanded that his writings should be burnt, being filled with scruples at the idea of having transgressed his vow of obedience in letting them be circulated without the previous judgment of a general chapter".[2]

[1] In Nelson's *Medieval Texts*, 1950; this work replaces his previous lecture of Ailred, cited by Bouyer on p. 127.

[2] P. 190. His brethren burnt one copy before his eyes but preserved several others.

Fr Bouyer's conclusion is a salutary warning against the cheap and easy view of Cistercianism as "the stronghold of archaism and literalism"; to him "there is no finer example . . . of true Christian humanism". On occasion he may seem to overstate his case, but he never ceases to be stimulating, well-informed and perceptive. The translation has been admirably done, capturing the vigour and clarity of the original; some new material is incorporated.

Pembroke College, Cambridge. J. C. Dickinson.

The Silent Rebellion. By A. M. Allchin. S.C.M. 25s.

Mr P. F. Anson, in his book *The Call of the Cloister*, systematically described the Anglican religious communities founded since 1845. Mr Allchin's concern is to illuminate the earlier history of this great revival by essays upon its leading features. *The Silent Rebellion* is written with such grace and sympathy and level-headedness as to attract and persuade the reader. He has used unpublished papers at Pusey House, at Clewer and at East Grinstead. Of particular importance, perhaps, is the demonstration that Carter and Clewer did more than any other community to establish the religious life as accepted and recognized within the Church of England; and there is an illuminating and balanced discussion of a vexed problem, the relations between Dr Pusey and Miss Sellon.

Why should the religious life be restored? In the earlier Victorian age bizarre suggestions were offered, even by so understanding but isolated a champion as Neale. Through these means, it was suggested, the Church might counter the activities of the Trade Union movement, or secure a useful weapon of apologetic against Roman Catholics, or enable parochial work to be done cheaply by men or women pledged to poverty. Most of these suggestions were mere pretexts. In recent church history it would be hard to find anything "purer" and less utilitarian than the revival of the religious life. If Carter helped the Church to accept it, R. M. Benson of Cowley was the giant of the movement, and Benson appears to have been incapable of allowing an admixture of motive, a smack of utility, into his make-up. And yet the communities which survived and became stable were almost always those which were not founded purely on doctrinaire grounds ("It is Catholic to have monks, therefore we must have monks"), but those for whom a work lay ready to hand, a work for which a community was the only, or the most effective, instrument. Carter of Clewer wrote in 1855 that they "had not planned the formation of a Sisterhood, and then sought out a work for it; but the work came to us to be done, and a Sisterhood was the only practicable instrument for carrying it on". Neale began to consider founding his sisterhood because the normal machinery seemed incapable of nursing the poor in the scattered cottages of his parish. Benson always associated his plans with the mission to the heathen, either at home or in India. It was natural that the times should offer the opportunity to men and women who had learnt habits of Catholic devotion through the instrumentality of the Oxford Movement. But

the opportunity was in a manner a contemporary opportunity, a pastoral occasion. And perhaps this is why the revival was so rarely romantic, so rarely touched by a mere desire for imitation of medieval precedents irrespective of the circumstances of the day. Among the leaders, Neale was the most susceptible to romance about the middle ages; he had come into the movement in a neo-Gothic flurry and the mark never left him. But he succeeded because he was composed of far more than retrospective sentimentality. And Benson eyed sentimentality or romanticism and aestheticism alike with an equal distaste. He was, as Mr Allchin reminds us, "compounded of catgut and iron".

CAMBRIDGE. OWEN CHADWICK.

THE DOGMA OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION. Edited by Edward Dennis O'Connor, C.S.C. University of Notre Dame Press. $10.00.

The uniqueness of Jesus, incarnate God, confers uniqueness on his mother: there is only one Theotokos; but in what way Mary was different from other people, and so fitted to be the mother of God, is a problem with no easy answer. Scriptural evidence is scanty, and some of it is not helpful to a precise Mariology. Christian devotion to Mary has outstripped theology, and still does. The definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception in 1854 only confirmed what was generally believed in the Roman Communion at that time, as did that of the Assumption a century later. "There are strong indications", writes the editor in his preface, "that the Church is on the way towards a definition of Mary's Co-redemption and mediation of all graces." Here in action is a process of development in doctrine which it would be unwise for any Christian to ignore or to criticize without a careful sympathetic attempt to understand it.

This collection of essays is a magnificent exposition of the dogma; it is unlikely that a better will be produced from within the Roman fold. Fr O'Connor has gathered his team of contributors from four European countries, from U.S.A. and Canada, and one from Egypt. Their essays show much learning with scholarly discrimination; they are well furnished with footnotes where the sources of all quotations will be found, frequently with the ipsissimma verba in their contexts. The first chapter deals with the scriptural evidence, the next six with the history of the dogma, four more with the theological explication, and then come two supplementary chapters: one unexpected, examining some evidence offered by Islamic tradition, the other tracing the history of attempts to represent the Immaculate Conception in art. This last essay is illustrated with nineteen line drawings in the text and twenty-six photographic reproductions, which cover five centuries of artistic effort to picture the mystery from the fifteenth-century Bedford Breviary to the standardized statues of the present day. There is a bibliography of 100 pages.

The essays cover the ground without noticeable gaps, and such repetition as there is serves usefully to refresh the mind of facts

treated more extensively in earlier pages. The historical chapters are admirable: the long controversy is related fairly, both sides of the argument being frankly stated. It is interesting to discover how the familiar objections to the dogma were raised and answered centuries ago. The theological chapters are, to an Anglican, less satisfactory. They employ scholastic concepts and reasonings, and appeal for authority to papal encyclicals and to biblical texts ingeniously interpreted (e.g. Gen. 3. 15, "*ipsa* conteret caput tuum" instead of "ipse . . ."). It is curious that no mention is made of Job 14. 4. Fr O'Connor's own essay, "The Spirituality of the Immaculate Virgin", shows how from the assured standpoint of the Immaculate Conception theologians are moving on to justify the assumption implicit in popular devotion that Mary is, under Christ, "as an individual, a kind of personification or embodiment of grace, from whom others will derive it as participating in her fullness"; that she is a "kind of sacrament, mysteriously productive in others of that which is symbolized in her own person" (pp. 438–9).

Bp Pearson wrote in his Exposition of the Creed: "We believe the mother of our Lord to have been, not only before and after his nativity, but also for ever, the most immaculate and blessed Virgin." In the context the bishop is contending for the perpetual virginity of Mary, and "immaculate" must be understood as referring to that and not to the conception. The passage indicates her uniqueness among women. She is unique, too, both as the eternally predestined Mother of God, and also as the giver of a human body made out of her own to him of whose mystical Body we are members. This uniqueness then applies to her person and to her relationship with the Church; but need one turn it into dogmas? Some things are better left in the realm of devotion that the burden of faith necessary for salvation be kept light.

The Orthodox Church is devoted to the Theotokos yet "does not accept the Catholic Dogma of 1854 . . . this would separate her from the human race, and she would then have been unable to transmit to her Son this true humanity" (Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, p. 138). The dogma differs from all its predecessors in that it has no basis in recorded historical fact; it is a crystallization of devotional experiences which owe not a little to the medieval popularity of apocryphal literature such as the Protevangelium of James; it is defined in terms of a particular doctrine of original sin; it is claimed to be a defence against liberalism, but in fact runs dangerously close to modernism; and its logical consequences would seem to insert the Mother between the Son and the mankind he came to redeem. The circumstances of our Lady's conception and the means of her purification for her holy office are known only to God. Is it wise to be inquisitive about the secrets that the Lord God has hidden from human eyes?

This beautifully produced book was clearly a labour of love for the editor; it is well worth reading.

Ewhurst. Kenneth A. Pearson.

GRÜNEWALD: THE PAINTINGS. With two essays by J.-K. Huysmans and a catalogue by E. Ruhmer. Phaidon Press. 18s. 6d.

Thrice in the course of his widely discussed Ingersoll Lecture on Immortality, published last year, Prof. Oscar Cullmann refers with emphasis to the great Isenheim altar-piece of Grünewald as revealing, vastly more lucidly than language is able, the δόξα of the Resurrection body as Paul and the first Christians conceived it. By far the majority of his readers, however, will have explored in vain the art sections of their libraries for any sort of reproduction (and colour is really essential) of this singularly illuminating painting, to which there can scarcely be anything quite comparable in the history of art. Such frustration was, in fact, inevitable, because until a few months ago there was no adequate study available in English of this greatest of German painters, and it is only in this century that his full stature has been recognized even in his native country. Indeed, his real name—which was not Grünewald—was only revealed by painstaking and scholarly research in 1938. Yet he supremely exemplifies the climactic atmosphere of the eve of the Reformation, and, as Dr Nikolaus Pevsner has pointed out, comparable urgency cannot be found in the art of the period in England; though the glass of King's College Chapel, Cambridge, with the sculpture of Henry VII's Chapel at Westminster and the chancel-screen of York, belong to its ethos. Nor can anything from the hand of *Mathis der Maler* be found in any collection here except for a single drawing inscribed with his own name, apparently by himself, in the Ashmolean at Oxford.

Let it be said at once, what of any other painter might be thought an over-statement, that every representative theological library ought now to include this modestly priced and handsomely produced Phaidon book (or else the rather larger volume on the subject which also appeared recently at over three times the price from another publisher). For Grünewald is not only an entirely religious painter but essentially a *theological* one, who cannot be fairly appraised without theological interpretation. The result is that the ordinary art critic flounders in assessing him, linking him with Expressionism and the like. Consider for example the superb *Nativity* and its complementary *Angel Concert*, at Colmar. Their iconography derives from the Revelations of St Bridget of Sweden (fourteenth century)—published in Germany in 1502. The Virgin Annunciate emerges on the left hand from the threshold of the Old Testament in the "house and temple of Solomon before the new age of fulfilment". She is "Maria aeterna, chosen by the Creator as the Mother of God before the beginning of the world". She confronts herself in the flesh on the right fulfilling the New Covenant. A glass ewer between symbolizes the virgin uterus, the child's chamber-pot the humility of the Incarnation. Mary sits in a walled garden, the *hortus conclusus*. A thornless rose grows beside her. She is the "house of God" in the background. To disregard the Christian symbolism of Grünewald is as jejune as the attempt to demythologize the Bible.

The *fin de siècle* essays of Joris-Karl Huysmans which preface this picture book and descriptive catalogue exude the faintly febrile breath of the "Decadence" of which he was so recognized an exponent and, as art-criticism, would be distinctly dated were it not for their recognition of the theological inspiration of the paintings. On that account they are well chosen, and one is glad, for instance, to have preserved the following analysis of the *Resurrection* which so impresses Cullmann:

"This is a strong and handsome Christ, fair-haired and brown-eyed, with nothing in common with the Goliath whom we watched decomposing a moment ago, fastened by nails to the still green wood of a gibbet. All round this soaring body are rays emanating from it which have begun to blur its outline; already the contours of the face are fluctuating, the features hazing over, the hair dissolving into a halo of melting gold. The light spreads out in immense curves ranging from bright yellow to purple, and finally shading off little by little into a pale blue which in turn merges with the dark blue of the night.

"We witness here the revival of a Godhead ablaze with life: the formation of a glorified body gradually escaping from the carnal shell, which is disappearing in an apotheosis of flames of which it is itself the source and seat. . . . Having dared to attempt this *tour de force,* Grünewald has carried it out with wonderful skill. In clothing the Saviour he has tried to render the changing colours of the fabrics as they are volatilized with Christ. Thus the scarlet robe turns a bright yellow, the closer it gets to the light-source of the head and neck, while the material grows lighter, becoming almost diaphanous in this river of gold. . . .

"The triumphant nature of this ascension is admirably conveyed. For once the apparently meaningless phrase 'the contemplative life of painting' takes on a meaning, for with Grünewald we enter into the domain of the most exalted mysticism and glimpse, through the simulacra of colour and line, the wellnigh tangible emergence of the Godhead from its physical shell."

To use this book as a stimulus to meditation and mental prayer ought undoubtedly to prove exceptionally rewarding.

John H. L. Waterson.

Stoke D'Abernon.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Responsible Christian. By Victor Obenhaus. University of Chicago Press. (C.U.P.) 30s.

It is probably not widely known in England that American religious thought has for many years been concerned with the relationship between the Christian faith and everyday society. Towards the end of the nineteenth and at the beginning of the twentieth century the preaching of the Social Gospel received considerable recognition, and the interests of the Protestant churches extended not only to

problems relating to drink and gambling, but to industrial affairs and trade unionism. The Social Gospel is no longer the order of the day. Nevertheless, the churches' concern for social matters remains as strong as ever it was, and this fact is in part borne out by the appearance of *The Responsible Christian* written by Victor Obenhaus of the Chicago Theological Seminary. Prof. Obenhaus stands opposed to the theological approach towards social problems which was so popular in previous decades: more especially he sees the weakness in attempting to apply what might be called "the principles of Jesus" to current social issues. He states that many problems call for technical decisions and that no single Christian solution can be offered. What is important, he maintains, is that Christians should be made aware of certain social aspects of life which call for moral analysis and Christian witness. Failure in these areas means a failure of the Christian mission. He selects ten "frontier situations" and examines the problems involved, the historical background, successes and failings of Christians in the past, together with suggestions of what might be done in the future, though sadly these are few in number. His selection of subjects is inevitably limited. It is strange that there is no reference to such pressing issues as population, family life, atomic warfare. Instead, a weary furrow is ploughed through "Communism", "Church and State", and "Civil Rights". The most worthwhile chapters relate to public and private welfare and agricultural problems, and it is precisely here that interest may be aroused, as points are brought to the fore which have not been considered extensively in England. The importance of the industrial situation is not overlooked. "As the great frontier of the church a century ago was the expanding rural geographic frontier, to-day it lies in the interpretation of the Christian faith to industrial man" (p. 56).

The author confines himself entirely to the American scene, of which he is at times severely critical. He has written an introductory book for laymen—something which should not be overlooked—and his position is avowedly Protestant. However, he has succeeded in his task and he offers an up-to-date book of a kind which has no counterpart in contemporary England.

W. Pickering.

St John's College,
University of Manitoba,
Winnipeg.

On Reading the English Bible. By T. E. Jessop. Epworth Press. 5s.

Has the exciting moment at last come when the Bible can be introduced to people as a fresh unknown book to be explored? Can we find some way of avoiding the lack of skill in presentation which caused many of the last generation to reject it as irrelevant and boring? Prof. Jessop proposes a technique "for showing people how to read the Bible to the profit of their whole being".

His principle is that what is actually in the Bible should be explored without presuppositions, especially without the passive rever-

ence which puts ordinary intelligence in suspension. He gives clues about the meaning (and lack of meaning) in the usual lay-out and order, and about the language, with practical suggestions about the use of modern translations. In discussing the mental approach needed, he is at pains to help those with a narrowly fundamentalist approach to find a wider view. The final chapter suggests several systematic orders for reading the Bible. The usual short passages given in daily readings are not necessarily the ideal way for anyone seeking to understand the Bible as a whole. He points out the advantage of more concentrated spells of reading, covering a whole book at one sitting, at least in the case of the shorter books, and gives his own suggested order.

What is offered is concise and simply explained. At every point it directs you to the study of the Bible itself. The book could be used by individuals or by serious groups. It is not designed for the absolute beginner, for whom, as Prof. Jessop says, we still await some "carefully thought out" Bible reading technique. It is a contribution to the Church's efforts to produce active and informed lay people.

SHEFFIELD. MARGARET KANE.

BELIEVING IS SEEING. By P. V. Simpson. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.
ARTICLES OF THY BELIEF. By Caroline Adams. S.P.C.K. 4s.
THE BEGINNING OF WISDOM. By Cedric Astle. S.P.C.K. 4s.
JOSEPH IN TRANSIT. By Charles Jeffries. S.P.C.K. 4s. 6d.
WHAT IS THE BIBLE? By Daniel-Rops. Burns and Oates. 7s. 6d.
WHAT IS FAITH? By Eugène Joly. Burns and Oates. 7s. 6d.
LIGHT IN THE NIGHT. A Book for those in Bed. By a Religious of C.S.M.V. S.C.M. Press. 1s.

The first four of these books are "Seraph Books", the next two "Faith and Fact Books". Together they constitute a group of twentieth-century tracts that provides striking evidence of the complex situation in which any attempt at popular apologetics has now to be undertaken. On the one hand, if the nature and content of faith are to be presented and expounded, justice has to be done to its multiplicity of facets; on the other hand, provision must be made by adopting different techniques and styles of writing for a wide educational range among readers.

Simplest and most direct of the four Seraph Books is *Believing is Seeing*, written by a parish priest "for doubters" and covering the main distinctions under the two heads, "about belief" and "belief about". This is a handy introduction for adult inquirers, although they should be warned that the writer does not hesitate to put forward illustrations which might not survive scrutiny—for example, "the trouble with many church people is that they are like girls with wedding rings but no husbands. They have all the outward signs of Christians . . . but they have not the inward spiritual relationship". *Articles of Thy Belief* explores some of the same territory. Internal

evidence suggests that "Caroline Adams" is the pseudonym of a former medical student who is now the mother of a young family. She writes stimulatingly, but chiefly for the reader who can wrestle with expressions like "tohu-bohu", "neophyte", and "the basal stuff of God". The chapters follow the Apostles' Creed, except that surprisingly there is no separate section on the resurrection of Christ and less surprisingly sections are added on the Eucharist and Bible.

Mr Astle's book is "a teacher's testament". He is headmaster of Rykneld Secondary Modern School, Derbyshire, and his moving, and at times wistful, series of reminiscences and observations point candidly to the opportunities and difficulties in the school-church partnership to-day. This small human volume might be in the possession of school staffs, school managers and incumbents and read alongside the official or semi-official guides to the Education Acts.

From autobiography to fiction. Sir Charles Jeffries narrates the racy tale of a young student from West Africa who attempts to find his bearings in London. Through a chain of tragedy and adventure, Joseph experiments with alternative "-isms" until he meets an Anglo-Catholic vicar. It was when one Sunday evening in church "the priest with great reverence drew aside a curtain and opened a small cupboard on the altar, stepped back and knelt down" that the hero "felt that here at last he was very near the heart of the matter". The novelist admits that the congregation was "very thin".

The two Faith and Fact Books are considerably more substantial and will repay close and careful reading. Translations from volumes in the *Je sais–Je crois* series published in Paris, they include a number of points of similarity with serious Anglican literature, stressing the harmony in mature faith of reason, revelation and scripture. The non-Roman reader will wish to discard certain paragraphs and sentences, but he will gratefully accept the two books as models of what brief, balanced and scholarly exposition can be.

Light in the Night might well be in every hospital ward and beside every bed of sickness. It can be read by or to a patient. It deserves to be reprinted many times, especially if it can be done in larger type. Vicar, take it with you when you go visiting.

EASTBOURNE. W. W. S. MARCH.

JESUS IN HIS OWN TIMES. By Sherman E. Johnson. A. and C. Black. 12s. 6d.

His own times in this book rather overshadow the portrait of Jesus: the author has been more successful in his first part painting in the background than in the second where he deals with the Lord's ministry and death. At the same time, his clear and stimulating account of the background does set us thinking again, and sometimes anew, about the Gospel in its own context. The first third of the book is concerned with the light thrown on Jesus' circumstances by the discoveries at Qumran, and we are given a very good account of the contents of the Dead Sea scrolls.

The historical background to Jesus' ministry, Palestine in the last century B.C.—an intricate and often confusing story—is excellently done in a good, straightforward narrative, making the book a useful one for school use. About this New Testament background there is a freshness in the telling: but when the author passes to exposition of Jesus' teaching the book is less compelling. There is a perennial fascination about the problems raised by the Gospel narratives: he has not a lot new to say, but he gives a good restatement of them.

In the last chapter there are interesting comments on the historical development of Christology. It is a pity that in an agreeably produced book the proof-reading has not been more careful.

King Edward's School, Birmingham. Ronald Lunt.

The Development of the Ministry. By the Bishop of Bath and Wells. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

The Call of God. By Fenton Morley. S.P.C.K. 5s.

The first of these books is described as a "Working Paper" and was written by the Bishop in preparation for the work of the sub-committee of the Lambeth Conference (Ministries and Man-power). The second is one of the five books which S.P.C.K. is issuing as a "follow-up" to the Conference. It is important, therefore, to have the report of the Committee and the resolutions of the Conference in mind when trying to assess the value of these books. *The Development of the Ministry* inevitably suffers from having been the basis of the Committee's discussions: one cannot avoid the feeling that the material has already been worked over and sifted; and a good deal of it was clearly taken over by the Committee in their report. Nevertheless, the Bishop has collected a large amount of evidence and presented it in a remarkably clear and brief form. The summing-up of the arguments for and against voluntary or "tent-maker" priests is specially valuable, as is the list of questions about the office of Deacon. *The Call of God* is addressed to the whole Church and should provide much interesting material for study by groups of clergymen and laymen. Not everyone will agree with Canon Fenton Morley's plea for increased "centralization" in the Church of England, but he is certainly right in his insistence that the whole Anglican Communion suffers from an irrational use of its available man-power. One of the chief values of what the Bishop of Peterborough refers to as this "important book" is the down-to-earth way in which the author presents his questions. His first chapter heading, "What is the use of the Church?" brings us at once to the sort of question which ordinary people ask, and in the main he answers this and other questions in language which ordinary people can understand. The book is well-named, for it insists on clear thinking about the biblical meaning of vocation.

Westcott House, Cambridge. Kenneth M. Carey.

Listen to the Wind. By Douglas Webster. Highway Press. 2s. 6d.

Muhammad and the Islamic Tradition. By Emile Dermenghem. Longmans. 6s.

At Sundry Times. By R. C. Zaehner. Faber. 21s.

The Bridge is Love. By Hans A. de Boer. Marshall, Morgan and Scott. 15s.

Great Venture. By A. H. Dammers. Highway Press. 2s. 6d.

These five books would make good homework for any Christian intending to go overseas whether as a missionary or in any other capacity.

Listen to the Wind is the 1958 survey of work in which the Church Missionary Society is involved. Anyone who tries to cover the problems of churches growing up all over the world in so small a compass is probably driven to superficiality, and indeed this is not one of Mr Webster's better books. It is rather too full of clichés, oversimplified deductions and banal statements. (What are we to think of a school of evangelism in West Africa of which all we are told is that "there were addresses, discussions and tea"?) Mr Webster is freshest in writing of East Africa, to whose bishops the book is appropriately dedicated. The encouraging impression that comes out of the book is that all over the world, where quite revolutionary changes are taking place, the church and her missionaries again and again have "listened to the wind", seen the Christian needs of the hour, and with miserably inadequate resources have set out ahead of others in the attempt to meet them. The book also has some interesting things to say about the relation of a missionary society to the church in England itself.

Of the two books dealing with other religions, Mr Dermenghem's is the simpler. It is a good factual account of Muhammad's life and of the growth of the Islamic tradition and a brief anthology of Muslim literature from all periods, all within a book the size of a Penguin. It is an excellent book, but, with all its simplicity, it is not really a beginner's book. The atmosphere of Islam, with its origin in the faraway desert wars and strange pronouncements of the Prophet, is so remote from ours that it needs the deep personal sympathy of such books as Cragg's *Call of the Minaret* to woo us to it. This, however, will be an excellent reference book, and it is beautifully illustrated with photographs and photographic reproductions from Islamic art.

At Sundry Times is a new book expounding the view that Christ fulfils the deepest insights of other religions, a theory satisfying to Christians, but likely to be less acceptable to others. Who, for example, except Visishta Advaitists (and Christians), will accept that the development of Hindu religion culminating in the theophany of the eleventh chapter of the Gita, which Prof. Zaehner traces, really is a development rather than a series of different but equally valid approaches to truth? This theory, which Prof. Zaehner advances with a note of asperity towards those who might be tempted to disagree

(the usual black eye for poor Dr Kraemer), is perhaps not, however, the most important part of the book. The really valuable section lies in two remarkable chapters analysing the Indian contribution to man's religious knowledge. The author brings to his task a mind well trained in philosophy and psychology and a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures. He knows the questions we—particularly Christians—want to ask, and he is fearless in examining the validity of spiritual experience. He gives us a new definition of the word "religion", because he believes that much Hindu religious experience is not experience of God as another at all, but is rather experience of the immortal ground of one's own soul, sometimes thought, but wrongly thought, to be identical with the Supreme. This raises hard questions for Christian theology, which has often been content to suggest that the soul has no real immortality except in relation to God. It is a pity that in the treatment of this fascinating question, Prof. Zaehner brings less learning and profundity to the Christian aspect of the matter than one could have wished. There is at least one more question one wants to ask him. If it is true that "the Gita offers the promise, not yet the fulfilment" (p. 179), in what sense is the eleventh chapter to be called a theophany (p. 132), and what is meant by saying, "God seems to be speaking directly to man" (p. 130)? This is an exciting, but not altogether satisfying, book.

The Bridge is Love can, and often does, make very irritating reading. Here is a young German business man sent out to South-West Africa. As a serious Christian, he ran straight into the race question, and decided he must go on to South Africa to see things for himself. From there a number of doors opened, permitting an extended trip round the world. The constant desire to form his own impressions leads the author to adopt an unconsciously sententious and critical attitude and to introduce what strike one as occasional rash statements and superficial judgments which experience might have modified. Above all, one feels that although the author was successful in coming near to the real people of the countries he visited, he was a traveller without family or responsibilities, and so without the need to live out long-term solutions to the problems he sees so clearly. Yet, when all this has been said, the book remains an urgently needed plea that Christians overseas and Christian nations should act now as Christians in the matters of race relations, help to under-developed countries, and war. (There is a terribly realistic description of what happened at Hiroshima and its after effects.) After we have listened to the laboured explanations of politicians and the excuses with which we bolster up our compromises, this book comes out clearly on the side of the angels, and Mr de Boer's Christianity would do us all a power of good.

Last of all is a beautiful little book describing four years' experience as a missionary in the Church of South India. It has all the best of the anecdotal style, it is full of fresh and fearless judgments, entertaining stories and deep Christian insights, a delight to read from cover to cover. One feels that this is the way one would always

like to write about other people's countries in which one has lived, for it is the fruit of much true Christian friendship.

KERALA UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, SOUTH INDIA. GEOFFREY PAUL.

BOOK NOTES

THE January 1959 number of *Interpretation: a journal of Bible and Theology* (Virginia, U.S.A., $3.00 per annum) contains a valuable series of articles on the Book of Numbers. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* by J. T. Milik (S.C.M. Press, 12s. 6d.) will take a high place among the books that purvey information about the Dead Sea Scrolls to the non-expert reader. It is plentifully illustrated and very reasonably priced. The author is a Polish priest who took part in the excavations at Qumrân. Messrs Hamish Hamilton are distributing in England a remarkable series of Harper Torchbooks (paperbacks). They include reprints of well-known theological works, some of which have not been available for a long time, as well as some more recent works. The following are already on the English market: Friedrich Schleiermacher's *On Religion: Speeches to its Cultured Despisers* (12s. 6d.), in John Oman's translation with an introduction by Rudolf Otto. Ludwig Feuerbach's *The Essence of Christianity* (11s. 6d.), with an introductory essay by Karl Barth. Auguste Sabatier's *Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion based on Psychology and History* (11s. 6d.) and Adolf Harnack's *What is Christianity?* (11s.); these two books rank as classical expositions of "Liberal Protestantism" at the end of the nineteenth century. Harnack's book has an introduction by Rudolf Bultmann: the translation is by T. Bailey Saunders. (This was also recently republished in a cloth-bound edition, see THEOLOGY, December 1958, p. 522.) Karl Barth's *The Word of God and the Word of Man* (12s. 6d.), with a foreword by Douglas Horton. M. S. Enslin's *The Literature of the Christian Movement* (12s.), which is Part III of his *Christian Beginnings* and takes the form of an introduction to the books of the New Testament: it was first published in 1938. We warmly recommend these reprints: they are most attractively produced.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

BARRIE AND ROCKCLIFF: David Elton Trueblood, *Philosophy of Religion* (35s.).
JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: Raymond Abba, *The Nature and Authority of the Bible* (21s.).
COLLINS: A. O. J. Cockshut, *Anglican Attitudes* (16s.); Gerald Vann, O.P., *The Son's Course* (2s. 6d.); Jim Bishop, *The Day Christ Died* (3s. 6d.); John Knox, *The Death of Christ* (12s. 6d.).
EPWORTH PRESS: Eric E. Yelverton, *An Archbishop of the Reformation* (18s. 6d.); Clement H. Pugsley (Ed.), *A Preacher's Prayer Book* (8s. 6d.).
FABER AND FABER: C. H. Sisson, *The Spirit of British Administration and some European comparisons* (21s.); Michael C. Perry, *The Easter Enigma* (21s.).
HAMISH HAMILTON: S. R. Hopper (Ed.), *Spiritual Problems in Contemporary Literature* (12s.); William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism* (15s.).
HODDER AND STOUGHTON: *The Destiny of Man* (2s. 6d.); Geoffrey T. Bull, *God Holds the Key* (12s. 6d.).
MACMILLAN: Geddes MacGregor, *Corpus Christi* (30s.).
MOWBRAYS: H. E. W. Turner, *The Meaning of the Cross* (8s. 6d.).
JOHN MURRAY: S. C. Carpenter, *Eighteenth Century Church and People* (35s.).
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: G. D. Yarnold, *Risen Indeed* (9s. 6d.).
S.C.M. PRESS: Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Creation and Fall* (8s. 6d.); James M. Robinson, *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus* (9s. 6d.).
S.P.C.K.: W. K. Lowther Clarke, *A History of the S.P.C.K.* (21s.).
TYNDALE PRESS: Alan M. Stibbs, *The First Epistle General of Peter* (8s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

*Wantage
A Religious of C.S.M.V. THESE LAST DAYS
"An arresting and stimulating survey of the historic sequence of events seen through Christian eyes. . . . The author, well known in Anglican circles . . . succeeds brilliantly in showing the directing hand of God in world history." —*Daily Telegraph.* 9s. 6d., post 6d

*Kelham
Antony Snell, S.S.M. NEW AND LIVING WAYS
Described by its author as an explanation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, this is an absolutely first-class piece of Biblical scholarship, written with the clarity and simplicity of one who has thoroughly mastered his subject.
May. 18s., post 1s.

*Cerne Abbas
Fr. Hugh, S.S.F. NO ESCAPE FROM LOVE
This is *not* another little manual on confession, but an arresting and profound account of the history of an exchange between God and Man through the action and reaction of forgiveness. *May.* 6s., post 6d.

*Lambeth
C. R. Dodwell (editor) THE ENGLISH CHURCH & THE CONTINENT
The Lambeth lecturers on the cross-fertilising Christian influences between England and the Continent, include Dr Norman Sykes, Professors M. D. Knowles and R. R. Darlington, Owen Chadwick, W. A. Pantin and H. M. Waddams. *June.* 15s., post 10d.

FAITH PRESS

7 TUFTON STREET, LONDON, S.W.1.

THE FAITH TO-DAY

A. Mervyn Stockwood **5s net**

In some 80 pages the Bishop of Southwark has given us a vigorous presentation of the Gospel, insisting only on essentials. He has done this in the language of the "High Street" where, as he rightly insists, the Gospel belongs.

TOWARDS THE CENTRE

Charles Jeffries **4s 6d**

"An admirable book for the use of study groups who are going through the section on Church Unity in the Lambeth Report. It is informative, clear, well written, and a model of Christian charity." *Bishoprick.*

S · P · C · K

Symbolism in the Bible and the Church

GILBERT COPE

Mr Cope believes that the Church has the duty of re-examining the pattern of Christian symbolism and of the whole traditional Hebrew-Christian "mythology". 16pp plates and frontispiece 30s net

From Rousseau to Ritschl

KARL BARTH

In this translation of eleven chapters of *Die Protestantische Theologie im 19 Jahrhundert* Karl Barth discusses Continental thinkers who have had a significant influence on British and American thought—Rousseau, Lessing, Kant, Herder, Novalis, Hegel, Schleiermacher, Feuerbach, Strauss, Ritschl. 42s net

Religion and the Scientists

Edited by MERVYN STOCKWOOD

The purpose of this series of lectures, delivered in the University Church, Cambridge, was to encourage people who were accustomed to different academic disciplines to understand one another's language. *Contributors:* M. L. Cartwright, F.R.S., F. Hoyle, F.R.S., N.F. Mott, F.R.S., C. F. A. Pantin, F.R.S., Sir George Thomson, F.R.S., R. H. Thouless, F. G. Young, F.R.S. 5s net

The Gospel of God

HERBERT H. KELLY

This book, first published in 1928, is now reissued with a Memoir of Father Kelly by Brother George Every, who also gives a brief account of the beginnings of the Society of the Sacred Mission which was founded by Father Kelly in 1894. This new edition will introduce to a new generation the mind and spirit of a man perhaps only now coming into his own. 10s 6d net

SCM PRESS